DOCUMENT RESUME

①ED 025 629 08 VT 006 857

②Education and Manpower Strategies and Programs for Deprived Urban Neighborhoods: The Model Cities Approach. Final Report.

④National League of Cities, Washington, D.C. Dept. of Urban Studies.

⑥~~Spons Agency~~- Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

⑤~~Bureau No~~- BR 7-1199

⑦~~Pub Date~~ May 68

⑨~~Grant~~- OEG-1-7-071199-5153

⑧~~Note~~- 149p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$7.55

Descriptors- Adult Vocational Education, City Improvement, Conference Reports, *Economic Disadvantagement, Educational Programs, Employment Programs, *Federal Programs, *Interagency Coordination, Job Training, Manpower Development, Neighborhood Improvement, *Program Planning, Speeches, Unemployment, *Urban Education, Urban Environment, Urban Renewal, Urban Slums

This report attempts to identify effective strategies that might be used by city and school administrators in planning, initiating, and coordinating comprehensive deprived neighborhood manpower and education programs. It is the result of a 4-day workshop of leaders in local government and school systems, held in late 1967 at the University of Maryland, and involving 42 persons from 15 cities that had submitted Model Cities planning grant applications. Fifteen papers (included in this report) were delivered by some of the 28 expert practitioners, academicians, and federal administrators in the fields of education and manpower who served as the workshop faculty. The workshop focused on new strategies and programs, innovative approaches to a cooperative action by all agencies, and comprehensive manpower and education development operations, but no single strategy for success was uncovered. Experimentation, collaboration, and compromise were recognized as essential and certain guidelines for cities were developed, including: (1) Citizen participation in the planning and implementation of programs should be encouraged, (2) Cooperation and coordination between city hall, the schools, and others must be achieved, and (3) the Model Cities approach embodies the necessary elements and is the best current example of the paths to be followed to solve the urban dilemma. (ET)

BR- 7-1199
PA 08

NLC

EDUCATION AND MANPOWER STRATEGIES AND PROGRAMS FOR DEPRIVED URBAN NEIGHBORHOODS

THE MODEL CITIES APPROACH

MAY 1968

ED025629

VT006857

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN STUDIES
NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ED

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 7-1199
Grant No. OEG-1-7-071199-5153

EDUCATION AND MANPOWER STRATEGIES AND PROGRAMS FOR DEPRIVED URBAN NEIGHBORHOODS: THE MODEL CITIES APPROACH

May 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Final Report

Project No. 7-1199
Grant No. OEG-1-7-071199-5153

EDUCATION AND MANPOWER STRATEGIES AND PROGRAMS FOR DEPRIVED URBAN NEIGHBORHOODS: THE MODEL CITIES APPROACH

National League of Cities
1612 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

May 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

PREFACE

This report is directed primarily to local administrators and officials who are now, or soon will be, in the process of developing manpower and education programs designed to upgrade the quality of life in urban communities by eliminating the basic causes of unemployment and underemployment among the nation's non-white citizens.

A group of the nation's leading city officials, educators, experts in urban development, and academicians met at the University of Maryland November 29 - December 3, 1967 at a Workshop sponsored by the National League of Cities and the United States Office of Education. The purpose of the Workshop was to identify and examine strategies and programs that might be used by city and school administrators in planning, initiating, implementing, and coordinating comprehensive manpower and education programs for deprived urban neighborhoods.

The report itself is an analysis and a synthesis of the speeches, comments, and reactions of the Workshop faculty and participants. It is not in a true sense a workshop proceedings, but rather it is an interpretation by the League's Department of Urban Studies staff of concepts and responses expressed by both academicians and practitioners in the light of problems facing local government officials today.

Today, communities throughout the United States are facing the challenging task of eliminating or ameliorating the helplessness and hopelessness, the frustration and despair that permeates the slum ghettos of the nation's cities. The pathology within the urban slum includes bad housing, broken families, and rising crime rates as well as unemployment. It is impossible to isolate the problem of education and manpower from such other basic problems. Similarly, solutions must be sought not just in the slum ghetto, but in the total urban community. It is for this reason that the Model Cities approach, the utilization of all institutions and groups within the city to plan and carry out programs for the disadvantaged, provides guidelines for the solution of the manpower problems of the urban slum.

The League is deeply appreciative of the counsel and assistance provided by the Office of Education in the planning and presentation of the Workshop and the preparation of this report. The League gratefully acknowledges the contribution of the Workshop faculty — Mitchell Sviridoff, H. Ralph Taylor, Jack Howard, Allan Beals, Dr. Herbert E. Striner, Alan C. Beaumont, Thomas J. Brown, Lisle C. Carter, Jr., Professor James S. Coleman, Dr. David Gottlieb, Dr. C. Taylor Whittier, Professor Willard J. Congreve, Dr. Robert A. Dentler, The Honorable John Brademas, Professor George R. LaNoue, Dr. Hylan G. Lewis, Jule M. Sugarman, Professor Martha A. Derthick, Professor Richard H. Davis, David S. Seeley, Saul D. Alinsky, Raymond F. Male, Edward S. Cohen, Professor Clifton R. Jones, Earl C. Pyle, Dr. Lawrence D. Reddick, Thomas E. Waters,

Maurice F. X. Donohue — for the stimulating papers and provocative comments. Special thanks is also extended to Andrew S. Bullis, Gregory L. Coleman, Robert J. Corletta, Dr. Sidney A. Fine, Dennis J. Palumbo, and Lawrence A. Williams who served as Workshop discussion leaders. The League also wishes to express its deepest appreciation for the tireless effort put forth by Dr. Don T. Allensworth and Clinton A. Britt who served as workshop director and assistant workshop director and who prepared the preliminary draft report which was revised and edited by Lawrence A. Williams, Director of Contract Research for NLC. Finally, our greatest debt is, of course, to the local government officials — the men and women on the firing line — who generously contributed their time to provide us practical insight and understanding of the manpower and education problems facing the nation's cities.

Patrick Healy
Executive Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Preface		iii
Table of Contents		v
Summary of Major Findings and Conclusions		1
The Problem		3
Alternative Solutions		5
Strategies		5
Coordination of Inter-Agency Activities and Programs		5
Involvement of City in the Educational System		7
Decentralization of Policy Development and Program Administration		9
Participation of Citizens in Program Planning and Implementation		10
Programs		12
Manpower Development Programs		12
Education Programs		16
Paths of Progress		19
Appendix A	Workshop Faculty	21
Appendix B	Workshop Participants	23
Appendix C	Workshop Papers	25

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Two factors are primarily responsible for unemployment and underemployment of the ghetto resident. The first is the pervasive discrimination and segregation that has denied to Negroes the right to full and equal participation in American society. The second is inequality of educational opportunity that has denied to slum children the education necessary to compete effectively for meaningful jobs in our technological society.

2. Mayors must provide leadership and wholehearted support in the search for solutions to the manpower problem of the deprived urban slum dweller. As the political leader of the community, the mayor must assume broader responsibility for the well-being and social development of the entire city and all of its citizens. To this end, he must bring together all of the component organizations and agencies both within and without the city government.

3. Effective linkages must be established between city hall and the school administration to provide the collaborative effort necessary for the solution of the problems of deprived urban neighborhoods. Such linkages can best be established by dialogue and consultation relative to common community problems. Although mayors should be more concerned with education policy, they should avoid any effort that involves either sharing or transferring power.

4. There will be no single solution to the manpower problem of the urban slum ghetto. Local officials must seek out and try various alternative strategies and programs. As a consequence, success cannot, and should not, always be expected.

5. Traditional approaches to revolutionary problems almost inevitably fail. City and school officials, therefore, must consider new and innovative approaches for the elimination of slum ghettos from the nation's cities. However, although bold efforts are required, solutions to the problem must be found within the context of the nation's proven institutional framework and organizational structure.

6. Education is the key to economic independence in this nation's highly industrialized and technical society. Massive pre-school, compensatory, and cultural enrichment programs should be undertaken in order to upgrade the quality of education available to children from the nation's urban slum ghettos. However, studies show that compensatory and enrichment programs alone cannot provide equal educational opportunity. The inputs of the educational environment upon deprived children must be intensified through association and interaction with students from educationally strong families.

7. Local officials should seek the removal of artificial constraints imposed by labor, industry, and local government on the recruitment and selection of employees. Employers tend to look at such factors as education, work experience, criminal record, appearance, and speech when interviewing potential employees, but these factors may be unrelated to the requirements of the job. An applicant may not be able to meet accepted standards and still have the ability, or potential, for developing a usable skill. Such negative attitudes by employers and labor unions, combined with rigid protection-oriented civil service regulations, serve to prevent the assimilation of the undereudcated Negro poor into our society and thus restrain the full development of their and the nation's potential capabilities.

8. Citizen participation in the planning and implementation of programs designed to solve problems of deprived urban neighborhoods should be encouraged. Such participation can be a painful, traumatic experience. However, city and school officials willing to pay the price can maintain the channels of communication with ghetto leaders that are essential for the solution of urban problems.

9. The Model Cities approach — the concept that all institutions and groups operating within the city must jointly plan and carry out programs for deprived urban neighborhoods — is the best current example of the guidelines that must be followed if the manpower problems of urban slum neighborhoods are to be solved.

EDUCATION AND MANPOWER STRATEGIES AND PROGRAMS FOR DEPRIVED URBAN NEIGHBORHOODS: THE MODEL CITIES APPROACH

THE PROBLEM

Local government decision-makers are faced with political and social problems of fundamental and frightening proportions. In the wealthiest nation in the world there is a sizeable minority living in grinding deprivation. Nationwide in distribution, poverty is most apparent and destructive of human values among Negroes living in the grimy slum ghettos of the nation's cities.

Every major city in the nation has a slum ghetto inhabited by a sizeable non-white, unemployed, or at best underemployed, minority. A Bureau of the Census survey released in October 1967 reveals that the unemployment rate among non-whites is 7.3 percent, 2.1 times the unemployment rate for the white population. The problem is particularly acute among non-white teenagers. The unemployment rate in this group exceeded 26 percent in the first six months of 1967, 2.3 times the unemployment rate for white teenagers. However, unemployment rate data does not reflect adequately the seriousness of the economic problem of the ghetto resident. Recent Department of Labor surveys in slum areas of eight major cities reveals, in addition to unemployment, substantial underemployment. These studies show that:

- 21 percent of the ghetto residents working full time earn less than $60 a week.
- 37 percent of the families in slum areas reported annual incomes under $3,000.
- 47 percent of the families surveyed reported receiving incomes during the preceding year from unemployment insurance, welfare or aid to dependent children, or other non-employment sources.
- 11 percent of the male residents of the ghetto between 20 and 64 years of age were neither working nor looking for work.

Employment data for New York City are even more depressing. The unemployment rate among ghetto residents is 8 percent and the subemployment rate — which includes part-time workers, heads of households earning less than $60 a week on full-time jobs, and other marginally employed individuals — ranges from 28 to 33 percent. In addition, two-thirds of the New York slum youths who enter the City's neighborhood manpower centers lack occupational skills or work experience and almost one-half read at less than a fifth grade level.

Employment statistics only highlight one dimension of the problem. The pathology within the urban slum ghetto is pervasive, and includes bad housing, broken families, inadequate job skills, inferior and crowded schools, poor health care, and rising crime, delinquency, and illegitimacy rates. In addition, denial to the Negro male of adequate education, employment, health, and housing opportunities, and the separation of the Negro father from the family unit by misguided and unreasonable public welfare policies, has brought about the social deterioration of the lower-class Negro family.

The basic causes of unemployment and underemployment among the nation's Negro citizens go hand in hand. The first is the pervasive discrimination and segregation that has denied to Negores the right to full and equal participation in American society. The second is the inequality of educational opportunity. Professor James Coleman points out that if one compares the difference between Negro and white children in the urban northeast, it is apparent that after schooling the average Negro is at about the same level of achievement relative to whites as he was before – that is his level of achievement is still higher than 15 percent and lower than 85 percent of the white children.

Recent research findings of the Center for Urban Education in New York City support Professor Coleman's findings. In one group of 155 Harlem Negro youths who graduated from a ninth grade in 1963, only 27 percent received high school diplomas in 1966, and 32 percent, a significantly higher number, dropped out of school entirely between 1963 and 1966. In addition, only about 5 percent of 18-year old Negro youths in New York are admitted to college. Cumulative school failure begins for Negro and Puerto Rican students in New York City in the third grade. Although the initial gap between the poor urban Negro children and poor urban white children is relatively small, it increases significantly if little or nothing is done in the early grades.

Leading educators have long believed that the achievement gap between Negro and white children could be closed by massive compensatory educational programs for the disadvantaged. Dr. Robert Dentler reports, after more than 40 evaluations of compensatory education projects, that is is now evident that additional staff, new curriculum materials and special equipment, field trips, exchanges, and remedial efforts "fail to modify the curve of cumulative failure in early reading and arithmetic." The More Effective Schools program in New York City failed to increase academic performance significantly although it was "the best conceived, best funded, and best administered compensatory program."

The level of inequality of education between white children from predominantly middle-class families and Negro children from predominantly lower-class families is not so much the result of differences in facilities, curriculum, or teaching quality, as it is the result of differences in the students' home environment and the educational background of their fellow students. This is not to suggest that the physical plant and facilities need not be maintained at accepted standards, but that children from "educationally strong families" will outdistance those not having such environment.

With inadequate education and training, the young Negro is caught in a vicious circle of helplessness and hopelessness, frustration and despair. Without education and training, he is unable to secure the employment that will enable him to escape the perpetual cycle that has trapped his parents in economic deprivation and social segregation. A society that promises material comfort and equal opportunity to all and then excludes a sizeable minority from participation, faces the threat of radical social revolution. If the promise cannot be fulfilled, it should not be made, but once made it cannot be revoked. Earlier generations of Negroes accepted deprivation as their fate. Today's generation has seen the affluent society and is now demanding the opportunity to participate on an equal basis. Until such time as deprivation and segregation are eliminated, the crisis facing the nation's cities will continue to exist.

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

The problems faced by urban administrators are clearly evident. The causes of poverty and despair must be removed and full participation in the affluent society must become a reality for all. The Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 stands, conceptually at least, as a bold, new effort to improve the quality of life in the nation's cities by bringing the total resources of the community to bear on a neighborhood and its problems. Such concentrated effort will require the maximum amount of coordination and cooperation among agencies within the city and among agencies at the local, state, and federal levels. As Mitchell Sviridoff points out, it will in fact "...give a new, deeper, and broader dimension to those mundane words 'cooperation' and 'coordination' much to the dismay...of the more hide-bound of our local and state agencies." In addition, it "...will require more than...consultation, it will mean sharing of power, the involvement of community people in the decision-making process."

Various alternative strategies and programs must be sought and tried to deal with these problems. Strategies now being considered, or in effect, fall into four major categories: (1) coordination of inter-agency activities and programs, (2) involvement of city government in the educational system, (3) decentralization of policy development and program administration, and (4) participation of citizens in program planning and implementation. Because of the experimental nature of these strategies and the complex nature of the problems they are designed to ameliorate, these approaches are more often found in combination than as discrete alternatives.

Strategies

Coordination of Inter-Agency Activities and Programs

Typifying the Model Cities approach are experiments in inter-agency coordination of activities and programs at the local level and among agencies of local, state, and federal governments. Two such efforts at the federal level are the Concentrated Employment Program and the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System, both administered by the Department of Labor and designed to rationalize and coordinate various manpower programs. The Concentrated Employment Program, undertaken in 20 cities and 2 rural areas in 1967, attempts to combine under one sponsor all the manpower programs authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Economic Opportunity Act and all the supportive services necessary to make the unemployed and underemployed ghetto resident self-sufficient.

The Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System, often referred to as CAMPS, is designed to provide a mechanism for the systematic and comprehensive planning and implementation of the manpower activities of the Manpower Administration in the Department of Labor; the Office of Education and the social rehabilitation services in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Office of Economic Opportunity; the Economic Development Administration in the Department of Commerce; and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The CAMPS program encourages participation by state, local, and private agencies and groups involved in the manpower problem. By this means, it facilitates the development of both program and inter-agency linkages, and, in addition, it provides manpower administrators at the various levels with program information that, hopefully, will result in improved services to ghetto residents through alterations in program emphasis, adjustments in program levels, or inauguration of new programs.

Experimentation in inter-agency coordination is not confined to the federal level. Mitchell Sviridoff points out that major City agencies in New York City have been reorganized under "overarching administrations" to better serve the individual who has a variety of problems. The Human Resources Administration, for example, includes the welfare, community action, manpower, youth, health, and educational activities of the City administration. In addition, neighborhood centers housing these services will include representatives of both City and State manpower agencies. The fragmentation of local government services can be overcome by such one-stop service centers, thus reducing the confusion and inconvenience that occurs when several agencies attempt to deliver the same or similar services.

Essentially this same concept is being tried in 14 other cities under the Neighborhood Center Pilot Project jointly sponsored by the Department of Housing and Urban Development; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and Department of Labor; and the Office of Economic Opportunity. This program attempts to provide direct federal, state, and local services to families and individuals in economically and educationally deprived neighborhoods. Employment, welfare, legal aid, health, education, city services, family counseling, parent-child and senior citizen services, recreation, and planned parenthood services are all available at one location and on a coordinated basis. The 14 neighborhood centers in Fulton County are aptly described as "one-stop supermarkets of community services" by Atlanta Manpower Administrator George Rodgers.

Coordination of a mix of governmental and private agencies is being tried in several cities. Two such experiments in Chicago are Jobs Now and the Woodlawn Community Board. The Jobs Now program is a demonstration project funded by the Department of Labor and conducted jointly by the City, the Urban League, the YMCA, the State Employment Service, labor unions, local employers, and community associations. The purpose of the program is to provide employment counseling and placement services to deprived urban youth. The Woodlawn Community Board is a 21-member board, seven members each from the Chicago public school system, The Woodlawn Organization, and the University of Chicago. Creation of the Board is an experimental effort to eliminate communication barriers and to deal with education problems within the Woodlawn neighborhood of Chicago.

Involvement of City Government in the Educational System

Coordination of inter-agency activities at the local level must inevitably involve the establishment of workable linkages between city and school administrators. This can occur only if the psychological and emotional effects of separatist politics — described as "educational schizophrenia" by David Seeley, Director of the New York City Office of Education Liaison — can be purged from school governments. However, dichotomy between school administration and city hall is usually the custom and one that is well entrenched. Among the 40 largest cities in the United States, 33 have fiscally independent school systems.

The myth that schools and city politics ought to be separate was conceived by reformers to protect schools from partisan or corrupt political influence. In practice, as Congressman John Brademas points out, separation has tended to isolate schools from other local agencies, and, combined with the drive for professionalization, to insulate schools from the community.

The gap between the school system and the city administration cannot continue. Problems of education, housing, welfare, and unemployment are interrelated. The new Negro voting blocks are now insisting that public education must be responsive to the needs of the community. Professors George LaNoue and Robert Dentler take the position that the gap between boards of education and city halls can be closed only upon the initiative of the mayors. Professor LaNoue argues eloquently that the mayor, as the center of political power in the city, must make public education a priority matter, and that only in this way can public schools expand their functional role, effectively serve a broader clientele, and be sensitive to both city-wide and neighborhood interests. To assist mayors who are about to embark in the hazardous shoals of educational policy-making, Professor

Dentler suggests that the following hard questions should be asked:

1. Are citizens involved in capital improvement planning?
2. Is appropriate emphasis being given to education during the pivotal and strategic early childhood?
3. Are compensatory educational programs and proposed organizational changes, such as decentralization, designed to meet the needs and interests of students from deprived neighborhoods?

Congressman Brademas, also supporting closer school-city linkages, suggests that school officials should accept mayoral involvement, for without the support of municipal political leadership the schools will not likely win the battle to educate the urban slum child.

In spite of the increasing tendency for ghetto residents to hold the city administration responsible for public education, only a few mayors are attempting to expand their influence in school policy and administration. Mayor John Lindsay has established the position of Director of Education Liaison in his office, but, as Professor Martha Derthick points out, the New York City school system has put up considerable resistance to city hall involvement in the educational policy-making process. Analyzing current community trends, Professor Derthick finds little to indicate that school systems elsewhere in the nation would accept similar attempts by mayors to enter the school arena.

In support of Professor Derthick's contention, school representatives attending the Workshop rejected the idea that a strong, charismatic mayor could be the solution to the problem of providing educational services to the nation's slum ghettos. The political leadership of the mayor, far from being an asset as Congressman Brademas suggests, is considered a major liability by school officials. Because he is constantly in the spotlight and must regularly secure public endorsement to remain in office, the mayor must be credited with the development and promotion of successful programs. Such involvement is unacceptable to professional educators and, when combined with the fiscal separation that forces both jurisdictions to seek funds from the same source, places school systems and municipal governments in an adversary relationship. In those cities in which representatives of independent school systems report having close working relations with municipal officials, the mayor has not assumed a leadership role in education. Dr. Jarvis Barnes, Assistant School Superintendent, attributes good school-city relations of 20 to 30 years standing in Atlanta to dialogue and recognition of common community interests.

The key to achieving city-school linkages according to Erwin France, Administrative Assistant to Mayor Daley of Chicago, must be based on communication and collaboration — the working together of equals. Any effort that involves either sharing or transferring power is both unacceptable and unrealistic. City representatives, whether because they have come to accept the traditional city-school dichotomy or because they want to avoid responsibility for solving the school-ghetto crisis, express little interest in altering existing city-school organizational relationships. Thus, both school and municipal practitioners, although admitting the need for dialogue and cooperation between city hall and school administration, reject the radical approach involving the shift of power from the school bureaucracy to the mayor.

Decentralization of Policy Development and Program Administration

The growth of central cities and the concurrent reform and expansion of the local government bureaucracy, have made it difficult for the average citizen to communicate with elected officials and, thus, he has been deprived of an effective voice in local governmental affairs. Decentralization of policy development and program administration serves a two-fold purpose. First, it facilitates the delivery of services to the neighborhood population and, second, it promotes responsiveness to citizen needs by reestablishing direct communication between the citizen and local government officials.

Decentralization in education is taking place through both federal and local efforts. Federally funded programs, developed in accordance with Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, are now being worked out jointly by local school authorities and community action agencies. Foremost among local proposals to decentralize education is the report entitled "Reconnection For Learning" prepared by the Mayor's Advisory Panel on Decentralization of the New York City schools. This report, frequently referred to as the "Bundy Report," proposes the establishment of 30 to 60 neighborhood school districts each having 12,000 to 40,000 pupils. The governing body of each district would be an 11-member board, 6 members of which would be elected by parents and 5 members would be appointed by the mayor. The same principle of neighborhood decentralization of the school system and the delegation of powers to community boards is incorporated in a report prepared by Professor A. Harry Passow of Columbia University for the District of Columbia school board.

School decentralization, if carefully planned, can provide an educational system more responsive to neighborhood needs. In addition, the accountability of school administrators and teachers can be made both visible and relevant to standards of "people-centered responsibility." However, most proposals for decentralized administration of school systems assume that structural reorganization and the transfer of decision-making responsibility will automatically result in policies and programs befitting the needs and interests of students from deprived urban neighborhoods and, thus, restore public confidence in educational services. Such proposals usually fail to consider the constraints imposed by existing physical plants, personnel, and state and local statutory and administrative regulations relative to apprenticeship, education, certification, assignment, promotion, and tenure — the "bedrock" issues, as Professor Robert Dentler points out, that must be treated if meaningful educational services are to be provided Negro slum dwellers.

Decentralization of municipal operations have been undertaken in several cities in order to bring local government services to the ghetto resident and to provide a mechanism for establishing better relations between the city and the citizen. Such approaches are not designed to transfer responsibility for the performance of services. Two basic forms for such decentralization are the "storefront city hall" approach found in St. Louis and the neighborhood service centers found in New York and various other cities, including those found in the neighborhood center pilot program.

Participation of Citizens in Program Planning and Implementation

Citizen involvement in the decision-making process is a generally accepted and integral part of virtually all strategies designed to solve problems of deprived urban neighborhoods. The concept of "citizen participation" is embodied in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has developed guidelines to assist cities secure citizen involvement in the plans and programs of the city demonstration agencies. Alternatives available to local administrators planning such participation include:

1. Creation of a citizen advisory unit.
2. The establishment of a Model Cities board having citizen representation for program planning and implementation.
3. The establishment of formal or informal channels of communication with the existing community action agency or with other groups representing deprived neighborhoods.

Acceptance at the local level of the concept of citizen participation is due not only to the need to meet federal program requirements and minority group demands for "a piece of the action," but because it is now recognized by local officials that economic and social progress must go hand-in-hand; that exclusion of the Negro from American society is a primary cause of poverty and deprivation. Examples of such acceptance are found in the "Bundy Report" proposal to decentralize the New York City school system. As Mitchell Sviridoff points out, each community school district would be governed by a community school board controlled largely by parents. Each such board would have authority over personnel, budget, and educational policies within the district within the constraints imposed by state law. Basic to this proposal is the concept of local control over education — laymen determining public education goals and policies to be implemented by professional educators. Thus the Report, according to David Seeley, is a step toward the restoration of the balance between the public and the educator who, through professionalization and insulation, has closed the door to outside involvement.

An experimental effort to eliminate communication barriers and to deal with education problems has been undertaken in the Woodlawn neighborhood of Chicago by the 21-man tripartite Woodlawn Community Board. The Board — composed of seven members each from the Chicago public school system, The Woodlawn Organization, and the University of Chicago — has been created to determine if three major neighborhood institutions can collaborate to improve educational opportunity and achievement in the community public schools. Although not solving all communication and citizen involvement problems, the Board, according to Dr. Willard Congreve, has served the community well and is now in the process of getting experimental programs initiated in the Woodlawn neighborhood schools.

Little objection can be raised to citizen participation in the decision-making process on the grounds that mayors, councilmen, and school board members, as elected representatives of the people, have received a mandate to carry out the various functions of local government single-handedly. Unofficial constituencies — such as chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and labor unions — have always been involved in the decision-making process in those matters directly affecting them. The only difference between these organizations and one that represents the ghetto resident is that the former are wealthy and white and the latter are poor and black.

Saul Alinsky, organizer of The Woodlawn Organization in Chicago and FIGHT in Rochester, suggests that the only way to make the democratic process work in our pluralistic society is to develop bond fide, legitimate organizations to represent residents of disadvantaged neighborhoods.

In actual operation, local officials have found citizen participation fruitful on numerous occasions. Al Skelly of the Detroit public school system points out that the specifications of every school constructed in Detroit since 1958 have been developed jointly by a project advisory committee composed of community residents; representatives of the departments of recreation and planning; an architect; and school administrative, teaching, and maintenance personnel. The Detroit Model Cities program also envisages achieving a "full and equal partnership" between neighborhood representatives and the City. This does not mean that citizens will make all the decisions, but rather that decisions will be made jointly and differences will be negotiated. Similarly, City Manager Graham Watt found in developing the Dayton Model Cities plan that if ghetto leaders are convinced through give-and-take dialogue that local officials are sincerely striving to work out problems jointly, reasonable solutions can be achieved.

The concept of citizen participation, although accepted in principle as an effective and necessary strategy, frequently is found to be a painful, traumatic experience. Ghetto leaders, like politicians running for public office or labor officials negotiating a contract, have a constituency to represent and an image of militancy to maintain. As a consequence, citizen participation may exist simply as an adversary relationship in which each item for consideration must be negotiated. In such circumstances two levels of communication may actually exist — a public level involving confrontation, name-calling, and harangue; and a private level in which ideas can be exchanged and agreements reached. In addition, the demands of ghetto leaders frequently are outrageous, particularly at the beginning of negotiations or until convinced of the sincerity of local government officials. However, city and school officials willing to pay the price can maintain the channels of communication with ghetto leaders that are essential for the solution of urban problems.

Programs

A number of programs in the manpower and education fields have been initiated or are currently being developed by federal and local agencies and private organizations. All of these programs are designed either to develop job opportunities for residents of deprived urban neighborhoods or to equip these citizens with the education and training skills necessary to compete for adequate paying jobs.

Manpower Development Programs

Federal programs aimed at alleviating the problems of unemployment and underemployment are authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Economic Opportunity Act. Programs authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act are designed to provide workers with new or upgraded skills and to meet the job needs of workers displaced by automation, technological change, foreign competition, geographic relocation of industry, and other shifts in the labor market. These programs include: (1) Institutional Job Training, (2) On-The-Job training, (3) Experimental and Demonstration Training Projects, (4) Labor Mobility Demonstration Projects, (5) Redevelopment Area Training Projects, (6) Opportunities Industrialization Center Program, (7) Youth Opportunity Centers, and (8) Concentrated Employment Program.

Programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act are designed to overcome basic educational inadequacies of the unemployed, develop job skills for the unskilled, and provide placement, guidance, counseling, follow-up, and other selected employment services. These programs include: (1) Job Corps, (2) Neighborhood Youth Corps, (3) Community Action Program, (4) Work Experience Program, (5) New Careers Program, (6) Special Impact Program, and (7) Operation Mainstream.

All of these manpower development programs are relatively new. The oldest, the Manpower Development and Training Act, was enacted in 1962, but the program emphasis and approach have shifted. Originally designed to provide skill training to unemployed individuals with work experience and a basic educational background, the programs established by this act are now intended to serve disadvantaged people most of whom have had neither work experience nor basic education; people who frequently are not highly motivated. The oldest programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act — the Neighborhood Youth Corps and Operation Mainstream — have been in operation nearly three years. The newer programs were authorized in 1966 and only came into operation in the summer of 1967.

Recent efforts to reach the disadvantaged and marginal members of the work force have resulted in the creation of several major program innovations — Skill Centers, New Careers, Youth Opportunity Centers, Human Resources Development Program, Concentrated Employment Program, and Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System. All of these programs attempt, in different ways, to bring together in concentrated packages the multiplicity of manpower development services. The Skill Centers, a new institution created under the Manpower Development and Training Act, combines under one roof counseling, basic education, prevocational training, occupational and skill training, and job placement services. The New Careers program, established by the Economic Opportunity Act, seeks to provide work training that will enable disadvantaged people to enter certain sub-professional jobs as the initial step in a career ladder. The Youth Opportunity Centers, also established by the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Human Resources Development Program, established by the Wagner-Peyser Act, as amended, are designed to facilitate the identification of trainable unemployed individuals and occupations in which there are reasonable expectations for employment. These programs, working through state employment services, strive to find, recruit, counsel, train, and place in stable employment the lowest margin of the labor force. The Concentrated Employment Program, established under the Manpower Development and Training Act, is an inter-agency effort to coordinate existing manpower programs in 22 areas; the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System, established administratively, is a means for coordinating inter-agency manpower activities on a national, regional, state, and local level basis in 67 metropolitan areas.

Employment services, long the bailiwick of the state employment service, are now also being provided by numerous local government, semi-public, and private agencies in response to the stimulus of recent federal legislation. Manpower programs most frequently found in major cities include: Neighborhood Youth Corps, On-The-Job training, New Careers, Opportunities Industrialization Center, and Job Corps. In addition to these standard federally funded programs, innovative approaches are being tried in a few cities. In Atlanta, the school district has undertaken a program, financed by a Department of Labor grant, to prepare hard-core unemployed for employment through a "human relations approach." This approach is based upon the assumption that the inability of the hard-core unemployed to get and hold jobs is primarily a result of basic social problems that make it impossible for them to relate to their social environment, and only secondarily a result of a lack of job skills. The program, as described by Dr. Barnes, attempts to help the individual achieve an understanding of himself, his relations with other people and the community, and the dignity of man, as well as provide remedial education in communication skills, and, finally, on-the-job training. The program lasts about one year; the first six months are focused upon attitude adjustment and communication skills and the second six months are devoted to developing job skills and arranging for job placement. Similarly, disadvantaged youths in Chicago's Jobs Now program receive instruction in how to understand oneself, others, the community, and the work world and in money management.

Cincinnati officials also recognize that it does little good to provide employment to an individual if non-job related problems interfere with his work performance. As a consequence, an "employee diagnostic center" is to be set up as part of the Cincinnati pilot city program to assist people solve such non-job related problems as drinking, poor health, family sickness, and marital difficulties.

City and school officials, in spite of the fact that manpower development has only recently become a function performed by local governments, are able to report significant accomplishments with respect to training and placement. However, several problems have been encountered, the most serious of which has been recruitment. Without exception, local officials have found traditional recruitment techniques to be ineffective in efforts to reach the unemployed and underemployed ghetto resident. The slum dweller has lost faith in the established employment agencies that, until recently, have been unresponsive to the Negro community. As a consequence, recruitment must be an active, rather than passive process literally reaching out to the deprived community. To overcome the distrust and alienation of the ghetto resident, Chicago and Dayton have carried out recruitment programs through civil rights, church, and other organizations with "grass roots" contacts with potential program clientele. Similarly, Atlanta has placed professional interviewers in churches, pool halls, and other places frequented by these individuals usually considered unemployable. VISTA workers have been used in door-to-door recruitment campaigns in Baltimore. However, recruitment must be conducted on a realistic basis. The expectations of the ghetto resident should not be raised above possible levels of fulfillment. If manpower development programs are oversold or if jobs fail to materialize upon completion of training, the ghetto resident will lose interest and drop out, thus making future contact and recruitment more difficult. Similarly, long periods of training for job placement result in boredom and withdrawal from the program.

A second problem is the lack of availability of adequate day care for children of women recruited into manpower programs. Negro males have been particularly difficult to contact and recruit. They are seldom "at home" because someone is already looking for them for family support, alimony payments, or some other reason. As a consequence, large numbers of women, acting as heads of households, are recruited into the various manpower development programs. Such clientele, as Norvel Lee of the Washington, D.C., Work and Training Opportunities Center points out, have a high rate of absenteeism. "If a child gets sick or if she does not have an adequate day care plan, the mother must stay home in order to take care of the children." Absenteeism not only impedes effective training, but also the individual's ability to hold a job.

Lack of transportation is a third problem that frequently must be overcome. Jobs are often available in new industries opening up in suburban areas, but lack of either public or private transportation makes it impossible for the deprived in the central city to apply. Action for Boston Community Development is attempting to solve this problem by buying jalopies, repairing them in its automotive training program, and selling them to be used in car pools.

Artificial constraints imposed by labor unions, industry, and local governments, constitute a fourth and major problem impeding the employment of the ghetto resident. Providing job training is not enough. Local officials have found that manpower programs must be developed in cooperation with unions and employers and that commitments must be received that trainees will be accepted for employment. Failure to include unions in program planning and development will almost always result in failure to have the program implemented. The construction industry has been particularly slow in admitting Negroes into the trade. Yet, as Raymond Male the New Jersey Commissioner of Labor and Industry points out, public construction by federal, state, and local units involves staggering sums of money, a part of which could, and should, be used to provide employment opportunities for unemployed and underemployed slum dwellers. Some inroads have been made. Structural ironworker, electrician, bricklayer, and glazer apprenticeships are being opened to Negroes in Chicago. However, even where inroads are being achieved, recruitment of the hard-core unemployed has been slow because they do not believe that such positions are really being made available in good faith.

A few cities have undertaken intensive recruitment programs among minority groups, but local government, in most areas, is an untapped source of employment for the slum dweller. Dayton has been particularly active in efforts to attract Negro recruits for the police department. Other functions for which deprived residents are being recruited include health, welfare, community relations, and automotive equipment maintenance. Detroit also has been conducting extensive and successful efforts to attract the disadvantaged into city employment in these same categories. However, civil service regulations in many cities are so rigid that it is impossible to qualify someone for employment unless they have the precise prerequisites. Even the hiring of summer interns without examination may be prohibited by city charters. Such charter imposed restrictions are a problem in Oakland according to Jerome Keithley the City Manager, and past efforts to amend the civil service provisions have all failed. To overcome this type of problem, the Opportunities Industrialization Center in Dayton has undertaken pre-employment "feeder" programs to prepare the disadvantaged for jobs for which examination is required. This program includes special preparation for civil service examinations and adult basic education.

Employers tend to look at such factors ad education, work experience, criminal record, appearance, and speech when interviewing potential employees, but these factors may be unrelated to the requirements of the job. An applicant may not be able to meet accepted standards and still have the ability, or potential, for developing a usable skill. Negative attitudes by employers and labor unions, combined with rigid protection-oriented civil service regulations, serve to prevent the assimilation of the undereducated Negro poor into our society and thus restrain the full development of their and the nation's potential capabilities.

Education Programs

Inequality of education exists and constitutes a basic factor contributing to unemployment and underemployment of the ghetto resident. Recognizing this fact, the federal government has undertaken a number of supportive, remedial, and compensatory programs designed to upgrade the quality of education available to the underprivileged and to assist them raise their level of educational attainment. The basic programs to achieve these purposes are contained in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, and the Higher Education Act. In addition, other federal legislation — Civil Rights Act of 1964, Vocational Education Act, and the Vocational Rehabilitation Act — although not aimed specifically at the underprivileged, clearly can be of assistance in supporting educational programs that can benefit the poor.

Reading and arithmetic are the basic skills required for learning. It is in the teaching of these skills that schools most often fail disadvantaged children because of an inability to overcome the barriers imposed by the educationally weak home environment. New teaching techniques have been developed in recent years, but innovation and experimentation are not really carried on by massive educational systems. Professor James Coleman suggests that schools attack the problem of educational inequality by providing for: (1) contractual performance of teaching services, and (2) interaction among students from different racial and social backgrounds. Underlying these suggestions is the concept that the role of the public schools must be changed from a relatively passive one, in which the school provides the child with an opportunity to learn, to an active one in which the school assumes the responsibility for reducing inequality of education. Thus, the school is conceived "...not as a building into which a child vanishes in the morning and from which he emerges in the afternoon, but as a 'home base' that carries out some teaching functions but which spurs principally to coordinate his activities, and to perform guidance, testing, and to act as the child's 'agent'."

There are two advantages that would accrue from the teaching of reading and arithmetic to elementary level students on a contractual basis according to Professor Coleman. First, the use of private entrepreneurs would facilitate experimentation in teaching techniques and, because payment would be dependent upon increased performance measured by standardized tests, ineffective contractors would be quickly eliminated and only those techniques found to be most effective would be adopted and continued. Second, such an arrangement would provide a testing ground for new teaching techniques that could be adopted by the school if found effective.

The establishment of integrated schools in large urban centers composed of a multiplicity of jurisdictions is almost impossible. Professor Coleman's second suggestion is designed to eliminate the stifling effect of segregation by deliberately scheduling classes in other schools to provide continuing relationships among children across racial and social class lines. Similarly, certain extracurricular activities would be conducted on a cross-school basis. Thus, students from different home base schools would not be competing against each other, but would be members of the same team. Such interscholastic and extracurricular activities would intensify the inputs of the educational environment upon deprived children through association with students from educationally strong families.

Professor Coleman's two suggestions are not isolated proposals. The failure of public schools to meet the needs of the deprived urban slum dweller is causing many people to question traditional assumptions about the educational curriculum and methods of financing and administering the system. With increasing frequency, suggestions are being made relative to restructuring the public school system and even to establishing alternatives to public education. At present most public school systems are managed by a school board elected directly by the whole community. Five possible alternatives that have been suggested are:

1. Tax-supported tuition or vouchers paid to individual parents who would then be able to purchase education services from competing private schools.

2. Systems of direct grants to private schools in publicly-determined categories.

3. Contracts issued by public agencies, corporations, universities, and other groups who would manage "public" schools.

4. Parent-managed schools supported entirely through tax funds and open to all children in the neighborhood.

5. Public schools managed by a school board composed of various publicly-appointed representatives of community groups.

The first three alternatives, as Professor LaNoue points out, are supported by an unusual coalition of right wing economists, liberal editors, and such diverse groups as the Chamber of Commerce, the Catholic Church, black power militants, and White Citizens Councils. Supporters of decentralization are also a strange collation of white liberal intellectuals, white neighborhood school groups, and black militants. Opponents of decentralization, at least in New York, are administrators and teachers with promotion and tenure to protect and established school groups who want to preserve their political influence.

Dr. Herbert Striner of the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research takes a more moderate position, although reiterating former Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel's remark that "education is too important to be left to the educator." Dr. Striner points out that private technical schools are often better equipped than are public schools to provide basic skills for young slum dwellers and suggests that public officials should give serious consideration to subsidizing students wishing to attend such schools.

Proposals to radically restructure the educational system through extensive use of tuition payments or direct grants to private schools or parents, or through the contractual performance of educational services by entrepreneurs, fail to consider the reality of existing physical facilities and personnel. The only system able to handle the number of students in the central cities is the public school system. At best, the adoption of the proposed alternatives would have to be applied gradually on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis until facilities and teaching personnel could be assembled.

Central city school districts, recognizing that inequality of educational opportunity does exist, have undertaken a number of innovative and experimental programs. Special efforts are being made in several cities to overcome the educationally deprived environment of urban slum children by educating the parents to the fact that their children must go to school if they are going to compete in the market place for jobs. The adult basic education program in Baltimore, in addition to providing remedial education for those who are almost totally illiterate and preparing adults for the high school equivalency examination, provides instruction in nutrition and balanced meal preparation, consumer education, social relationships, and the development of good study habits — setting aside a certain time and providing a quiet place for study. Parents are told what to look for to determine a child's progress in school and urged to visit the teacher on their own initiative. Awareness and understanding in these matters is known intuitively by parents in educationally strong families, but foreign to those who have not gone through the educational process. The school system has successfully attracted substantial numbers of people to the program, in part at least, by providing free meals, bus service, and day care facilities and by using informal, unstructured teaching techniques. The teaching is done in ten housing projects and three churches.

Atlanta has undertaken an experimental project in which education is considered a total community project, involving parents as well as pupils and professional educators. As a part of the changing concept of education, community schools are open from 8 a.m. to 11 p.m. all year long. In addition to courses leading to high school diplomas, courses are offered in any subject of interest to 10 or 12 people.

The Detroit school system is undertaking a five-year compensatory educational program similar to New York's More Effective Schools program. The Detroit program will be operated by a separate system functioning within the existing school system, class size will be limited to 22 students, and all of the latest teaching techniques will be employed. The major thrust of the program will be to raise the achievement level in reading and mathematics.

Four projects have been undertaken in Rochester to upgrade the educational level of deprived children. In the most recent undertaking, Project Unique, an old school in the ghetto area was renovated and staffed by expert teachers. Approximately 130 children from the inner city slum, the outer city, and the suburbs attend the school on an ungraded basis. A concentrated compensatory education program has been undertaken in an inner city primary school. Class size has been reduced to 15 students and each classroom is staffed by a specially trained teacher and a teacher aide. In addition, four remedial reading teachers and a speech correction specialist are assigned to the school. The Rochester school system has undertaken two programs to upgrade educational opportunities of students in racially imbalanced schools. In the first, now in the third year of operation, children from the inner city slum are transported each day to wealthy suburban community schools. In addition to this urban-suburban transfer plan, inner city slum children are attending outer city schools and outer city children are attending inner city schools on a voluntary basis. About 2,000 of the 45,000 students in the school system are in this project.

Little effort has been made to upgrade the level of education available to urban slum children by radical restructuring of the school system. Antioch College has been operating the Adams-Morgan district in Washington, D.C., on an experimental basis for several years, and similar programs are contemplated in New York. However, widespread acceptance of contractual performance of educational services does not appear to be a likely prospect. Substantial political opposition would doubtless be exerted by school administrators, teachers, established school groups, and citizens unwilling to see the existing capital investment in facilities wasted. This opposition probably would not be offset by parental support. Ghetto parents, already suspicious of corporations and universities as Professor LaNoue points out, want to control the schools themselves.

PATHS OF PROGRESS

The objective for local government officials is clear. Solution of the manpower problems of deprived urban neighborhoods must be found. The paths to that goal are neither straight nor clearly marked. In reality there will not be one path but several: solution of the problem will require a mix of strategies and programs. It will require hard work, patience, money, and, above all, it will require innovation and experimentation, collaboration and compromise.

Local government officials must seek out and try new strategies and programs. Traditional approaches to revolutionary problems almost inevitably must fail. Similarly, all component institutions and agencies in the nation's cities – city and school officials, private industry and labor, and, most important, local community organizations and representatives of the deprived – must collaborate to achieve jointly that which cannot be achieved separately. At the same time, these institutions must compromise, for, as Saul Alinsky suggests, compromise is the essence of democracy, the method of meeting the demands of various conflicting interest groups.

The Model Cities approach – the concept that all institutions and groups operating within the city must jointly plan and carry out programs for deprived urban neighborhoods – is the best current example of the guidelines that must be followed if the paths of progress are to be found.

APPENDIX A

WORKSHOP FACULTY

Saul D. Alinsky
Executive Director
Industrial Areas Foundation

Allen Beals, Director
Great Lakes Region
U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity

Alan C. Beaumont
Director of Education and Training
General Precision Controls Corporation

The Honorable John Brademas
U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Education and Labor

Thomas J. Brown
Assistant to the President
Polaroid Corporation

Lisle C. Carter, Jr.
Assistant Secretary for Individual
and Family Services
U.S. Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

Edward S. Cohen, Staff Member
Bureau of Work Programs
Manpower Administration
U.S. Department of Labor

Professor James S. Coleman
Department of Social Relations
Johns Hopkins University

Professor Willard J. Congreve
Director, Urban Education Development
Project
Graduate School of Education
University of Chicago

Professor Richard H. Davis
College of Education
University of Toledo

Dr. Robert A. Dentler, Director
Center for Urban Education, and
Professor of Sociology and Education,
Columbia University

Professor Martha Derthick
Department of Government and
Research Associate
School of Education
Harvard University

Maurice F. X. Donohue
The Administrator
Work and Training Opportunity Center

Dr. David Gottleib
Special Assistant to the Director of
Job Corps and
Professor, College of Human
Development
Pennsylvania State University

Jack Howard
Deputy Manpower Administrator
U.S. Department of Labor

Professor Clifton R. Jones
Department of Sociology and
Anthropology
Howard University

Professor George R. LaNoue
Teachers College
Columbia University

Dr. Hylan G. Lewis, Fellow
Metropolitan Applied Research Center
New York City and
Professor of Sociology
Brooklyn College

Raymond F. Male
Commissioner of Labor and Industry
State of New Jersey

Earl C. Pyle, Project Director
On-The-Job Training Project
Baltimore Urban League

Dr. Lawrence D. Reddick
Executive Director
Opportunities Industrialization Center

David S. Seeley
Director of the Office of Education
Liaison
City of New York

Dr. Herbert E. Striner, Director
Program Development
W.E. Upjohn Institute for
Employment Research

Jule M. Sugarman
Associate Director
Project Head Start
U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity

Mitchell Sviridoff, Administrator
Human Resources Administration
City of New York

H. Ralph Taylor
Assistant Secretary for Demonstrations
and Intergovernmental Relations
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development

Thomas E. Waters, Director
Labor Education Advancement Program
Baltimore, Maryland

Dr. C. Taylor Whittier
Executive Director
Central Atlantic Regional Educational
Laboratory

APPENDIX B

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Atlanta, Georgia
Gregory Griggs, Alderman

Dr. Jarvis Barnes
Assistant Superintendent for Research and Development
Board of Education

George C. Rodgers
Manpower Administrator
Economic Opportunity Atlanta, Inc.

Baltimore, Maryland
John O. Hopkins
Assistant Superintendent for School-Community Relations
Department of Education

Dr. Robert C. Lloyd
Director, Special Projects and Programs
Department of Education

Herman C. Bainder
Specialist, Special Projects and Programs
Department of Education

Dr. N. Neubert Jaffa
Administrator, Elementary-Secondary Education Act Administration
Department of Education

Boston, Massachusetts
Tom Flood
Head, Manpower Division
Action for Boston Community Development

Boston, Massachusetts
Peter Cove
Director of Urban Development
Action for Boston Community Development

Chicago, Illinois
Erwin A. France
Administrative Assistant to the Mayor

Louciene Watson
Manpower Representative

Russell Liest
Board of Education

Cincinnati, Ohio
J. U. Allen
Director of Urban Development

Barry Cholak
Director of Community Development Program

Wilbur J. Linder
Department of Urban Development

Harry T. Martin
Director of Citizens' Committee on Youth

John Shreve
Associate Superintendent
Department of Education

Dayton, Ohio
Graham W. Watt
City Manager

Dayton, Ohio
William Schmidt
Model Cities Planning Coordinator

Harold L. Boda
Assistant Superintendent
Board of Education

Curtis Hicks
Opportunities Industrialization Center

Detroit, Michigan
Conrad Mallett
Special Assistant to the Mayor

David Cason
Office of the Mayor

Al Skelly
Board of Education

Newark, New Jersey
Aldo Giacchino
City Planning Officer

William Drake
City Planning Officer

Oakland, California
Jerome Keithley
City Manager

Stuart S. Phillips
Superintendent of Schools

Oxnard, California
Paul Wolven
City Manager

S. H. Steward
Superintendent
Oxnard School District

Salvator Sanchez
Councilman

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Mrs. Betty MacAfee
Manpower Director

Court Daspit
Model Cities Representative
School District of Philadelphia

Patrick McLaughlin
Development Coordinator

Mason Moton
Model Cities Representative
School District of Philadelphia

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Earle T. Onque
Model Cities Coordinator

Robert Peebles
Director of Special Projects
Board of Education

Paul Hummer
Director of Programming
Mayor's Commission on Human Resources

Rochester, New York
Edward Stephan
Coordinator of Buildings and Grounds
City School District of Rochester

St. Louis, Missouri
George Eberle
Model Cities Representative

Dr. Gerald Moeller
Director, Division of Federal Relations
Board of Education

Washington, D.C.
Norvel L. R. Lee
Chief, Work-Experience Section
Work and Training Opportunity Center

APPENDIX C

WORKSHOP PAPERS

THE REALITIES OF POVERTY AND GOVERNMENTAL ACTION

Mitchell Sviridoff
Administrator, Human Resources Administration
City of New York

It would be very easy for us to succumb to the mood of gloom, even despair, that is sweeping the ranks of responsible Federal, state, and local officials who are concerned with the plight of our cities. We meet to discuss a program which has been in a state of crisis since its birth — and we do so in a time of domestic crisis, a crisis which is unprecedented since the Great Depression, and which seems to be inadequately perceived by the Congress, on the one hand, and the nation at large on the other.

The Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 was hailed as a bold national declaration of commitment to achieve the goal of improving the quality of life in our cities. But its progress through Congress was tortuous at best. The President's initial request for $2.6 billion to carry the program over six years was hacked down to less than a billion for only two years. Then, in a prolonged appropriations fight, his request for $662 million for fiscal 1968 was whittled down to $300 million.

One hundred ninety-three cities submitted applications to share in $11 million in initial planning grants. Sixty-three cities won out in the stiff competition, and many of them are represented at this workshop. But most of us will have to make do with considerably less money than we had hoped for and felt necessary. Bold rhetoric, it is clear once again, does not automatically lead to bold action.

The nation as a whole has just passed through the worst summer of internal conflict since the Civil War. Yet the country is now in a state of near political paralysis, with Vietnam and budget pressures hampering the capacity of the Executive to act effectively. The tensions generated by summer riots have brought forth a sad response from the Congress: a futile search for scapegoats, half-baked or hysterical "answers" such as the House's "riot control" legislation, and a reluctance to pass legislation that might appear to "reward lawbreakers."

The middle-class and well-to-do receive twice as much in governmental housing subsidies, through tax breaks, than do the poor; but rent supplements, one of the more promising notions to remedy this inequity, remain pitifully inadequate. Harsh, punitive, unworkable, and, at bottom, immoral, restrictions were written into the House's version of the Social Security Amendments under the guise of "reforming" the welfare system. The poverty program was made to run a House gauntlet that has disillusioned millions whose hopes it had raised. Delayed, reshaped in concept, and cut in authorizations, it barely survived. In the process, community action programs around the country have closed for lack of funds — and the loss in momentum and experienced personnel who took other jobs may well be crippling to such new programs just barely off the ground.

It is tempting, and probably justified, then, to attack the House as irresponsible. But, as Senator Mansfield and columnist James Reston have so wisely pointed out, the House is doing just what it was designed to do: reflecting fairly closely the current views of the majority of Americans. If this be true, then we are faced with a political problem of fundamental and frightening porportions.

People who have "made it" and who are surrounded by material abundance, people whose daily lives are immune from even the sight of the ugly social blotches which infect our cities, people who feel threatened not by a personal fear of poverty but by the increasing demands of a militant and long oppressed Negro minority for equality in housing, jobs, and education — these are not people who are likely to rush to the support of massive social and physical renewal programs. To many of them, this sort of program smacks of special attention and privileged action for an undeserving sector of the society. Sponsoring and administering such programs even in the thirties was difficult enough. But given the changed circumstances of this nation — the affluence of the majority, the complex and generally hidden nature of poverty, the fact that those at the bottom are now more often of a different race, the distractions of a perplexing war — the political difficulties of implementing such programs today are enormous.

Meanwhile, the problems of the ghetto fester and worsen. Despite a general advance in all social indicators for Negroes taken as a whole, a recent Federal study notes the "distressing evidence...that conditions are stagnant or deteriorating in the poorest areas."

The pathology is clear: bad housing, broken families, inadequate job skills, inferior and crowded schools, poor health care, rising crime, delinquency, and illegitimacy rates.

In New York, our welfare population has just passed three-quarters of a million — and the budget to support them will top a billion dollars next year. The bulk of that population, over half a million, is made up of women and their children receiving Aid to Dependent Children. The fastest rising category is that of General Assistance, which receives no Federal support. A major proportion of that category is composed of men working full time but whose incomes are so low or families so large that they need public assistance in order to live.

In our ghettoes the unemployment rate is around 8 percent. But the new "subemployment rate," which includes those who work part time, heads of households who earn less than $60 per week on a full-time job, and others hovering at the margin of unemployment, ranges from 28 to 33 percent. Many factors combine to bar these individuals from the thousands of jobs open in New York, but the main reasons are inadequate basic education and a lack of skills. Two-thirds of the youth who enter our Neighborhood Manpower Centers lack any sort of vocational skill or work experience. Almost half read at less than a 5th grade level.

In sociological terms, we have only recently become aware of the reinforcing nature of the destruction of Negro family life, through the separation of the Negro father from his family, first under slavery, now because of welfare policies, and through the denial of adequate educational, employment, health, and housing opportunities.

In such circumstances it is not surprising that the Negro becomes impatient, hostile, and to a large degree alienated. To him, the promise of America is a hollow one. The legal doors have opened to him — but the doors of practical opportunity remain closed. The physical ghetto, then, also becomes a ghetto of the spirit — a sense of spiritual as well as physical entrapment. The suppressed rage generated by such conditions can easily break out in violence; the man with little stake in society finds little reason to bow to its conventions or obey its concepts of law and order.

To date, governmental actions to treat this nexus of problems have only lapped at their fringes. This is nowhere more evident than with respect to New Haven, Connecticut, where I directed a community development program from 1962 to 1966. Why did disturbances occur in New Haven, I have often been asked, where more money was spent per capita than in any other city? How could it happen in the "original model city?"

To begin with, New Haven is a model city only in relative terms. As Mayor Richard C. Lee said many times — and long before this summer's flareups: "If New Haven is a model city, God help urban America."

The point the Mayor is making is that even with an $800 per capita investment in urban renewal — many times the amount spent in any other American city — New Haven is not able to provide decent homes for all its people. Funds for education, job training, health, and related human resources programs are even more inadequate, which further underscores the relativity of the model city label attached to New Haven.

Clearly, vastly increased resources are needed. But even when they become available, they won't transform ghettos into Edens overnight.

We are dealing with problems that developed over several decades, and many of the psychological factors that inhibit solutions stem from the days of the slave trade.

Thus, beyond the necessary volume of money, it takes continuity of commitment over an extended period of time and a minimum of restrictions on the use of funds. No program of economic and social development can operate with any hope of success if its administrators and the communities for whom it is designed have to cut back operations radically one year, expand the next, and perhaps cease work in one or more key areas in the third year. This kind of accordion-like funding has inhibited success in our foreign aid program. It is bound to have the same result in our domestic efforts.

Nor can local administrators and community people do their best if the funding source puts them in an operational straitjacket by a host of guidelines and restrictions. Experiment and innovation are keys to community development. We have few models to guide us; we learn as we work.

This means that we must allow for mistakes and even for occasional ineptitude. We must be able to start in new directions without having to look over our shoulders to see whether we have been declared unworthy and can expect punishment in the form of a cut in money.

When our space engineers slip up and a multi-million dollar rocket plummets into the ocean off Cape Kennedy, we take it in stride and provide more money for them to start all over. But when we don't score instant successes in social experiments, scary headlines and finger-shaking Congressmen are our reward. Are people less worthy of our patience and solicitude than hardware?

All of this is very gloomy sounding, indeed; but I haven't dwelt on it this long to start the Workshop off on the note of despair I mentioned earlier.

I have done so first because it is useful to start a Workshop of this nature with a picture of the social and political obstacles to assimilation of the poor into the mainstream of American society.

Secondly, however, it seems to me that there is another side to this picture, a side best understood in contrast to the difficulties involved.

This is a marvelously adaptive nation, whose laws and institutions have been modified on numerous occasions to meet the demands of the times. Our flexibility will be tested by the current stresses and strains, but there seem to be several hopeful signs.

First of all, if the House of Representatives is giving us difficulty, it is clear that the Senate is not — primarily because it too is doing precisely what it was designed to do: taking the longer and less impassioned view, funding an acceptable poverty program, considering a major job creation program, and deleting the objectionable features from the Social Security Amendments. This is a classic response of the American political system, a compromise that has sustained us before and, I hope, will continue to do so.

Secondly, with progressive domestic measures in a state of siege at the Federal level, local governments have begun to move. Mayors like John Lindsay, Richard Lee, and Jerome Cavanagh are supremely competent leaders who are prodding and cajoling their cities into facing the urban crisis — and doing something about it, at least to the extent their limited resources will allow.

In New York, for instance, we have recognized that the fragmented nature of most local governmental activities makes it difficult for government to respond adequately and effectively, with a concern for human dignity and fulfillment, to the needs of a single individual who is likely to have a variety of problems. All major city agencies have been reorganized into over-arching administrations to facilitate coordination and cooperation. My own agency, the Human Resources Administration, includes the welfare, community action, manpower, youth, and educational activities of the city government. We are bringing government to the ghetto, establishing neighborhood manpower, welfare, and health centers. Our manpower centers will include representatives of the major city and state manpower agencies, thus ending the confusion of a multitude of agencies attempting to provide similar services to the same population — and usually trying to do so from downtown.

Mitchell Ginsberg, our Commissioner of Social Services, has instituted innovations in welfare policy and procedure which have national implications. We are experimenting with a simple "Declaration of Need" in affidavit form to establish eligibility for welfare payments — thus freeing social workers from time-consuming and demeaning investigations and allowing them to provide the social services for which they were trained. We have also instituted an experimental program of incentives to work, allowing a welfare recipient to retain a portion of any income he earns.

In education, decentralization is occurring on two major fronts. Projects conducted under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are now being worked out jointly by local school authorities and community action agencies. And the New York school system itself, the largest in the world, may soon undergo significant change. I'm sure you have all heard of the famous — or, according to some, infamous — Bundy report, the report of the Mayor's Advisory Panel on Decentralization of the New York City Schools. The title of that report is "Reconnection for Learning." And, as a member of that Panel, I can assure you that the title was not lightly chosen. We propose to reconnect the educational process occurring in the classroom to the parents, the community, and the city it serves. This would be done through the establishment of 30 to 60 Community School Boards, which would be controlled largely by parents and which would have authority, under State law, for personnel, budget and educational policies in districts as large as most medium sized cities.

Such developments in New York, of course, are matched by those in some of our other major cities.

The third hopeful sign is the Model Cities program itself and gatherings like this one. Despite the increasing competence of some of our larger local governments, it seems fairly clear that we all have a long way to go. If all the money our mayors dream of were made available to them, racial peace and social progress in our cities would not be assured. In addition to money, it takes a more universal and even more sophisticated capability to use money effectively.

It requires institutional and legal changes and the further development of leadership and technical know-how in all communities, especially those which have had little or no opportunity to acquire or practice these skills to date.

"To bring the total resources of the community to bear" on a neighborhood and its problems is the purpose of Model Cities — and that process is something the program will force us to learn. It will involve the kind of planning we are not used to. It will require more than mere consultation; it will mean the sharing of power, the involvement of community people in the decision-making process. And, finally, it will give a new, deeper, and broader dimension to those mundane words "cooperation," and "coordination," much to the dismay, I'm afraid of some of the more hide-bound of our local and state agencies.

The difference in emphasis all this implies is fundamental and manifests itself in three ways. First, the basic premise of some government activities must change — from a passive provision of services to those who ask for them, to an active seeking out of those needing such services.

Second, innovations in organizational form are necessary. Most local government services are organized according to the administrative integrity and efficiency of the services themselves, not to mention, of course, the convenience and habit of the civil servant.

Problems, however, are seldom so neatly and separately packaged. An effective Model Cities program will require government, at least where it touches people, to be organized in a manner that will allow a total and comprehensive attack on the deep-rooted, inter-related, and overlapping problems of the recipient, be it an individual, family, or neighborhood. One solution we have found effective is the neighborhood multi-service center, manned by representatives of all agencies, from whatever level of government, pertinent to a particular kind of problem. Another is the Community School, which stays open until late at night, 12 months a year, providing all manner of educational, cultural, recreational, health, and social services.

But these need not be the only solutions — and that leads me to the third point. In such an endeavor, flexibility in program and policy is essential. No single path will lead to success in the inner city. A variety of approaches must be sought — and tried — and in such circumstances universal, or even frequent, success cannot always be expected.

My experiences in New Haven and New York with such policies, programs and organizational innovations indicates that this will be an agonizing, slow, and tempestuous process — but it can also be an exhilarating and rewarding one.

Now, with only $300 million to spread among 63 cities, it is clear that the rebuilding process will hardly be a wholesale one. But at present that is not the point. Model Cities is the first large-scale governmental experiment with social and physical development. It is also an explicit reliance upon local initiative and capacity. Its stress on institutional reform and the development of human resources through publicly supported programs of planning, housing, education, and training, is rooted in a concept which matured in the thirties: the idea that poverty and its companions — disease, crime and inequality — are products primarily of the social, physical, and economic environment rather than inherent individual deficiencies. Hence, there is a public responsibility to act to correct those elements of the social-economic system which deny equal opportunity to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In standard political labels, then, Model Cities is liberal in intent, conservative in application.

The task of those planning and implementing Model Cities proposals is clear: At a time when the nation lacks the will to make major monetary commitments to domestic programs, we have the opportunity to develop institutional forms, administrative skills and techniques, and political and policy agreements which will enable cities to make full use of the more substantial resources which must come later. It is a rare opportunity with limited but nonetheless substantial sums of money.

In the malaise of this disquiet winter, ideologues, most national political leaders, even average citizens, are stymied — and a mood of pessimism reigns. Many of the "doers" — the pragmatists, the planners, the administrators, the local elected leaders — share these feelings. But, fortunately, they are closer to the action, and as a result, many of them are in this room, grasping, as always, at an opportunity to begin on the future despite the doubts of the present.

It's a necessary and hopeful task.

MANPOWER ASPECTS OF THE MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

H. Ralph Taylor
Assistant Secretary for Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

I keep looking out to see if Santa Claus is coming with the snow. I am afraid he is not. We are going to have to do the work ourselves. Maybe that is my message to you. The Model Cities program is not going to bring any great flood of new money to make it easy to change things. There is going to be enough new money to make it attractive. Conceivably, there will be, in fact there has to be, some concentration of old money. But this program is going to work to the extent that in the funded cities, people like you, representing three of the major areas of concern, not the only areas of concern, but three of the major ones, make it work.

Local jurisdictions — municipalities and school districts — are independent, I would suspect, in virtually all of the cities represented here in this room. Similarly, I am willing to bet that the manpower programs are fragmented in every city represented here that is trying to make the Department of Labor systems work. And yet, if we are going to have the kind of impact, the kind of resolve in the — I do not like the term "deprived area" — slum or the ghetto, if we are going to have the kind of impact that has to be there to keep things from exploding, then all three forces represented here and others have to work together in a way that you have never worked together before. And that really is what the program is all about.

We will give you some extra money to help try to pull things together as a carrot is used to move the mare. We will give you far less planning money than you think you need — it may even be less than you really need — but far less than you think you need, because that is all the legislation gives us. We funded approximately 60 percent of the planning requests. That is a pretty substantial cut, but we think we set up a planning process that will permit you to do what you need to do with that 60 percent. We set up a planning process that requires you to keep on planning after the end of the first year. There is no dichotomy: planning and execution are not two worlds, but one.

The declared purpose of the Model Cities program is to expand housing and job and income opportunities; to reduce dependence on welfare payments; and to improve generally living conditions of people who live in slum and blighted areas. These objectives are to be accomplished through the most effective and economical concentration and coordination of federal, state, and local public and private efforts to improve the quality of urban life. It is the quality of urban life that we take as our focus; not physical renewal or any of the individual social welfare elements by themselves.

The Model Cities legislation requires manpower programs of sufficient magnitude to make a substantial impact on physical and social problems, and to make marked progress in reducing, among other things, underemployment and enforced idleness. The legislation requires that such manpower activities and related programs provide widespread citizen participation and maximum opportunity for employing neighborhood residents in the deprived area in all phases of the program. Now how do we think this is going to be done?

First, the role of the general purpose government in the city is going to be absolutely central. The responsibility for this will rest upon the mayor. He establishes the City Demonstration Agency. That Agency cannot be an independent entity like the old housing authority or the renewal authority that, when once appointed, ran its own way. The CDA can do the job, but it must be directly responsible to the mayor and the council. We look upon the CDAs not as deliverers of service, but as the entity that will help general purpose government hold together a structural form deliberately left vague and unstructured by our requirement because of the tremendous diversity of local conditions throughout this land. The CDA is supposed to work out some form of structure that will result in an effective, integrated, functioning operation in the community. That does not mean that the school boards must lose their independence or that the CAP agencies must be captives. It does mean that somebody has to look at the reality of the governmental pattern in a particular city.

What is the relationship between the mayor and the county welfare board? What is the relationship between general purpose government and the school board? Examine the manpower program description that's in the packet prepared for you. You find you have the state employment service running the human resource development program. You have local CAP agencies controlling another project. You have MDTA operated a different way. And there are very few cities that have paid any attention to manpower training and development. What individual, responsible to the mayor, has had responsibility for the development of manpower programs? We are suggesting that those cities that want to participate in manpower development -- and we are not out selling the program in terms of "everybody come in" — will get their programs funded. This is not a Jacksonian program where everybody's entitled to a bit of the spoils. We fool ourselves at times, but we like to believe that we have a Jeffersonian program where the ability to do the job becomes all important.

We are asking a number of questions of those cities that want to participate in the Model Cities program. How are your cities structured so diverse but related programs will fit together to make a meaningful mosaic? What is the relationship? What kind of effective working relationship do you have with the independent board of education so that what they are doing in vocational education, and what they are doing in the education process generally bears a relationship to some larger objectives of other parts of the governmental structure? What is your relationship with the manpower programs which are largely state controlled?

What is your relationship with the welfare structure? What is your relationship with the private sector, because I do not care how many wonderful training programs there are, if you do not get their cooperation in helping to create jobs and opening the doors so that people get the training, you are frustrating the people, not helping them.

The Model Cities program places responsibility at the city hall level. The city must put together the kind of structure that is suited to the needs and problems of your community and which will result in a working relationship between all the forces that have to participate. What does this mean as far as the manpower component is concerned? It is recognized as a part of a tremendously important goal. The end is larger — the end is improving the quality of urban life for the people who live in those areas, opening the doors for them, bringing them back into the mainstream. Once a larger objective is accepted by all of the components, then, hopefully, the program jealousy and the program separatism that prevail when people think in terms of their own objectives rather than the larger objective, will disappear.

The Model Cities planning process is very complex, though it sounds easy when I describe it. We want you to understand the problem and then analyze its impact in your neighborhood. You will then need to develop a strategy for the solution of that problem, a one-year action program, and a five-year plan in terms of that strategy. It is very simple to describe, but to make it work, in a period when there is not going to be adequate funds to lubricate the wheels of change, the people in the community must examine what they have done. We are suggesting that you ought to be evaluating the effective use of your own resources in terms of the larger framework of analysis and your own strategy to meet that problem. This will mean some institutional change, some shifts in the use of funds. And that is why I said it is a lot easier to describe the needs of your communities than it is going to be to do something about them. No magic silver bullet or lovely panacea — guaranteed annual wage, guaranteed minimum income, or negative income tax — will solve the problems today. If we look only toward the rewards of the future world, we are going to have a very uncomfortable time in the present world.

I am suggesting that you must examine the uses of your resources. What does Model Cities provide? If you are able to coordinate the use of federal programs, you receive 80 percent of the non-federal share of those programs. Only $200 million was appropriated of the $400 million that was our estimate of what it would require. The 63 cities funded during the first year range in size from Pikeville, Kentucky, and Smithville, Tennessee, to Chicago and New York. Twenty of these cities have populations under 50,000; we have many small cities in different locations in order to see what develops in areas with different kinds of problems. Though not enough money is available to solve the problems, the funds provided will give you a chance to experiment. The monies will give you leverage to try some changes in your cities. Furthermore, this money has one attribute that no other federal money has — flexibility. So long as it relates to your plans and meets your situation, the federal government does not care what you do with it. If you receive the money because you have a $10 million local contribution renewal, which entitles you to a loan of $8 million, there is no re-requirement that the $8 million be used in connection with an urban renewal project or with anything physical. You can use it for anything in your community or neighborhood that is part of the plan. This is a major attribute of the program — a flexible money policy. This, I think, is a major appeal.

If this program is going to work, it has to make an impact in the job area. I would be disturbed if increased employment or increased income through employment is not one of the major strategies, and major goals in every plan. You can rehabilitate housing, you can provide the people with social services, you can improve the educational system, and you can put a park in every block, but there is nothing that gives dignity like a job. Housing is important; schools are important; the other things are important. In the long run, it is the availability of jobs that provides the key to personal satisfaction and national progress. This means that some of the communities have an economic development problem. You cannot create jobs simply by wishing. There has to be incentives for the private sector. The program has to make sense from the point of view of the private investor, for it is what he does that creates jobs.

On the other hand, perhaps you can get the private investor to analyze the implications of his efforts. In 7 metropolitan areas, approximately 950,000 jobs were created in the period from 1955 to 1965. Of these 900,000 jobs were located in the suburbs. The other 50,000 new jobs created were in the central city and virtually all were in service industries and highly sophisticated businesses like real estate and finance. If the Model City process involves the people who are responsible for decisions such as industrial location and who can influence the patterns of discrimination and segregation that separate the places people can live from where they work, then we can get some change. One of the myths of American society — and I think the myth is being destroyed — is that the man in the ghetto is not willing to work. We have got to get people to see that what they are doing is to deny them the opportunity to work.

In many cases it is not going to be the creation of jobs but the illumination of their existence, and the providing of skilled training, and making sure that there actually are jobs. Unless there is a relative certainty of jobs, individual motivation is not going to be there. We must get word to the school system that the jobs are open and that if people do train, there will be a reward. What we are looking for in your manpower analysis, your problem analysis, is a realism that reflects the situation in your community — that will tell people what it is really like. We cannot do that for you. We can only help pull together the resources at our end.

We are going to have the utmost cooperation of the Department of Labor. Jack Howard's paper spells that out very well, so there is no need for me to talk about the mechanics for cooperation. We hope to have concentrated employment programs in the model cities and the model neighborhoods. We are going to provide a manpower expert with skills that cut across the various fragmented manpower organizations as they have existed in the past. We hope that the mayors, the staff leaders, and the Model Cities program directors will seize the opportunity to employ a person skilled in manpower and to give him the responsibility for pulling these things together at the local level.

There are many new career jobs that ought to develop from this effort — rehabilitation specialists, jobs in housing management and in the medical area. We are still grappling with the problem of a performance standard. When that is determined we will send it to you. If you try to determine ways of reducing unemployment and underemployment in the Model Cities neighborhood and use the pattern of unemployment and underemployment in the rest of your community as a standard, then you will have a reasonable kind of performance record to aim at. I would like to illustrate this process by talking about one aspect of the job training program problem. Neither of us has the answer to this problem, but I think it would be helpful to you if I were to state the problem and our approach to it.

How do we get jobs in the reconstruction of the neighborhood for the people who live there? This is one of the objectives of the concentrated employment program. We think it is an absolute essential to our program. I think any city that has the illusion that it can send all-white crews into the heart of the ghetto while the men in the ghetto are unemployed is sadly mistaken. I would not want to do it. Construction is a complex business and requires a lot of skill. The rent of the man who is to live in the building, whether it be a new house or a rehabilitated house, has to support the mortgage, and the mortgage has to support the cost of construction. If there are diseconomies, or if it is of poor construction so that maintenance costs go up, the burden falls on the man who is living there.

I do not have to spell out for you the evolution that has been going on in the building trades. Neil Hagarty, president of the building trades, is going to make a speech tomorrow in Miami in which he is going to say that the doors have to be opened and he intends to open them. The building trades are peculiar organizations. I was told that recently an officer of a local electrical workers' union told the international president to stay out of local affairs. The president called to ask that a nephew of the chairman of a congressional committee be permitted to join that union. Building trades have a high degree of local autonomy and local authority. You cannot make a national deal and expect to have it carried out without their support. We have been, at the national level, working to create a better climate, and we have to keep at it, for the decision as to how people are going to get on a job is going to be made in your community by the local unions, and you have got to work it out with them.

What is our suggestion as to how you approach it? I think this illustrates the philosophy and approach we are trying to follow in the program. We suggest to the communities that they organize the building trades, the central labor council, the home builders, associated general contractors, key representatives of minority groups, the employment people and, if appropriate, and it probably will be, the school people. The first thing they should do is to get the facts. What is the construction labor supply? What is the volume of work that people agree is the maximum that the labor supply can do, given its present size, and age, and composition? Is the local union open or closed? Is it really open, or is it open only on a token basis? What is the pattern of apprenticeship? Is it open? How many apprentices are going in? Let us analyze the facts — the volume of work they are doing and the projection of the volume of rehabilitation and new housing and other construction that will have to be done if your community is to meet its model city program objective. And look at the way you intend to stage that program. Let us not be heroes by saying we are going to build a thousand units the first year when, if you look realistically at what you have, you know you cannot begin to relocate the families that would have to be relocated to make the area available for a thousand units. Look at it realistically and you know you have not got the labor supply, or the number of contractors and subcontractors required to increase the construction rate from an average of 200 units to 1,000 units.

You have to examine what you have and what you might do, and compare that with what the labor force has been doing. It could be, and this is our presumption, that if you discuss the facts in this way people who might otherwise object will say: "You know, this is an increase in the size of the pie, and we cannot handle it." If they demur then at least you have the facts to bring before the community. You thus move the conflict away from ideology and abstract principle to the specific. I have no objection to discussing ideological conflicts, but I think it is more effective if we move the problem to another level. This is the kind of approach that we suggest be taken. From it we may get some local groups that say: "We agree with the priority that the community sets on rehabilitating this neighborhood. We recognize that it cannot be done the old way, and therefore, we are going to provide some skilled foremen and we will go along with the creation of a rehabilitation generalist category." If we receive that kind of response, we are going to find some ways to create jobs that open the doors, that make sense, and if we get that, then we are going to move a step further.

The question we hope you would ask as you move along with us is: "What are the long-run career opportunities?" If those people become rehabilitation generalists, what are the channels that exist for getting into the union on a larger basis? One of the things I would hope would be done as you work out your manpower program is to avoid the creation of dead-end programs. Programs should be career-oriented so that people can have upward mobility. They should not be identified as being in a special, low-skilled, less-accepted, less-privileged, less-anything-else category in society. We can state objectives like those and I can make either scolding or inspirational speeches, depending upon the audience and the need, but I cannot do your job. You have to do that, and the process requires a different kind of relationship among the key elements that are involved — the job, manpower people, the school people, and general government.

The general government should assume the responsibility for fulfilling the larger social and economic objectives of the community. The various specialized components will contribute their own special skills, expertise, and devotion within that larger framework. If we develop that pattern in a number of Model Cities, I think we will have instituted some changes in the way local governments function in areas that have not historically been their responsibility. This in itself will have a major impact on the quality of life not only in model neighborhoods, but in our cities generally.

THE STATUS OF DEPRIVED NEIGHBORHOOD MANPOWER AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Jack Howard
Deputy Manpower Administrator
U.S. Department of Labor

Within the past several years the Federal Government has initiated a number of manpower development and training programs and related services aimed at overcoming various manpower problems which result from increasingly sophisticated technology and rapidly changing social conditions. Some of these major problems are: (1) A situation where, in spite of an overall high level of economic activity, high unemployment persists among groups which are handicapped in the job market by lack of education and by race, sex, age and traditional hiring practices; (2) Large numbers of poor persons; and (3) Shortages of qualified workers in a wide range of essential occupations.

Most of the Federal programs designed to deal with these problems are relatively new and we have only recently acquired the experience required to develop systematic plans for coordinating their administration as planned responses to a defined and measured "universe of need" for manpower development services.

This paper includes:

(1) A very brief discussion of the dimensions of manpower problems and the universe of those who probably need some sort of manpower services.

(2) A description of the manpower programs administered by the Department of Labor available to meet these problems.

(3) A discussion of what we have learned about the effectiveness of these programs from our experience to date.

(4) A summary of our current plans for improving the coordination of these programs, providing rational linkages between programs and increasing their effectiveness and efficiency.

(5) A summary of recent innovations in coordinating Department of Labor programs with those of other agencies to establish linkages, increase program effectiveness and efficiency and provide the mechanisms for mounting manpower components as part of the Model Cities Program.

Basic Dimensions of Manpower Problems

The number of persons who could benefit from manpower services is obviously very large. Planners in the Manpower Administration have developed estimates of the universe of persons needing such services by identifying the target populations defined in Congressionally authorized programs directly involving the Department. These target groups include: (1) The unemployed with special consideration for youth and older persons; (2) The underemployed, defined as those who are working part-time for economic reasons; (3) Persons working full-time at wages below the poverty level as defined by the Office of Economic Opportunity; (4) Inmates of correctional institutions who are to be released within a year; and (5) Persons who are not in the labor force but ought to be — that is, those who are without work, in need of work, capable of work, but not looking for work because they believe no jobs are available for them and have given up looking.

Taken together, these groups are estimated to total about 13 million persons. A sizeable proportion of these persons reside in the disadvantaged neighborhoods of our urban areas. For example, about a third of all the unemployed in the nation live in the 20 largest U.S. metropolitan areas.

We do not know everything we should know about the manpower and employment problems of disadvantaged neighborhoods, but we do know enough to have some idea of the magnitude of the job we need to undertake. To cite just one source of information, in November 1966, a series of surveys was made in slum areas in several major cities. These surveys indicated that:

(1) The unemployment rate in these areas as defined by traditional statistical concepts was about three times the average for the rest of the country.

(2) 6.9 percent of those listed as employed worked only part-time compared to 2.3 percent for the nation as a whole.

(3) 21 percent of those working full-time earned less than $3,000 a year compared to 15.4 percent for the nation as a whole.

(4) 11 percent of the men aged 20-64 in these neighborhoods were nonparticipants in the labor force compared to 7 percent of the nation as a whole.

(5) One out of every three residents in these areas has a serious employment problem.

However, even though the percentage of residents with such problems is high, we have an assortment of tools already available to us which can go a long way toward solving those problems. The problem is clearly of manageable proportions. The thrust of the Department's planning now must be toward coordinating these programs so they will have the maximum effect on those who need them and developing linkages with other programs which are aimed at breaking the poverty cycle. The effort to coordinate and link programs focuses on providing smooth transitions between the services needed by each individual to become self-sufficient through employment at an adequate wage.

Description of Available Manpower Development Programs

In the last few years, the Congress has responded to the obvious and deep-seated employment problems in the nation by authorizing a variety of programs aimed at assisting the unemployed, increasing the skills of the labor force, and reducing the disparities that exist between jobs available and persons seeking work. A brief discussion of some of the more important of these programs which are administered by the Manpower Administration follows.

Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) — provides for the joint administration of training and skill development programs by the Department of Labor and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The programs are designed to provide workers with new skills where needed, to upgrade present skills, and to meet the job needs of workers displaced by automation, technological change, foreign competition, geographic relocation of industry, and other shifts in the job market.

The major MDTA programs are the institutional training program, given in a classroom setting, and the on-the-job training (OJT) program. Counseling, testing, and similar supportive services are given to participants. Institutional training is provided in public and private educational facilities for a great variety of occupations below the professional level, although refresher training is offered for certain professions such as nursing.

In the OJT programs, training is provided at a job site by an employer under contract with the Department of Labor. Private businesses, labor unions, trade associations and public agencies are participating as sponsors in the program. Training costs are covered by MDTA funds, while sponsoring employers pay wages to the trainees. OJT projects cover more than 700 occupations below the professional level, with health care and automotive occupations accounting for the largest number of trainees. In many cases OJT is coupled with supplemental or related training, provided to groups of trainees in a training facility which may be either in a school or on the premises of an employer. While such instruction usually covers technical matters directly related to the training occupation, it may also include academic education essential to effective job performance.

Supplementary manpower development activities under the MDTA include the following programs.

(1) Health Services — a limited program of physical examinations, medical treatment, and prostheses for persons unable to pay for them or receive them without cost from other sources and yet who are otherwise eligible for MDTA training.

(2) Part-time training — an experimental program for workers in areas or in occupations in which there are critical skill shortages.

(3) Other than skill training, i.e., communications and employability skills training — a program of instruction and practice to teach individuals techniques related to attainment of a job and functioning in a job milieu.

(4) Special manpower programs conducted under the MDTA encompass several different types of projects, including experimental and demonstration programs. Experimental programs involve studying ways and means of resolving or alleviating manpower, employment, and/or training problems through systematic experimentation with new techniques. Demonstration projects are operational in nature and are undertaken to display and demonstrate the feasibility and desirability of tested and promising ideas, techniques and programs not yet in general use.

The programs thus far have concentrated on (a) identifying distinctive needs of unemployed and underemployed groups not being aided effectively by established programs and (b) developing and trying new ways to "reach" such workers and help make them trainable, to provide occupational skills, and to place them effectively in jobs. Target groups have been primarily unemployed urban slum area youth; minority groups facing cultural, psychological and other bars to employment; low-income rural residents; the mentally handicapped; and older workers with limited education and skills.

Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) — is a work-training program for disadvantaged youth under Title I-B of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended. Delegated to the U.S. Department of Labor by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the NYC program provides useful work experience for disadvantaged youth in order to increase their employability or encourage them to continue their education. Except for political parties, all public agencies, private organizations, whether profit or nonprofit, and commercial establishments may sponsor projects providing these job opportunities. Guidelines for the development and operation of projects are provided by the Department of Labor; however, broad latitude is allowed to sponsors to encourage local innovation.

Various size areas may be served by a NYC project. One project may serve a part of a city, an entire city, a suburban area, an entire metropolitan area, a county, a number of counties, a state or parts of several different states.

NYC activity is described in terms of its in-school and out-of-school programs. The in-school program provides part-time work training for disadvantaged school students. This program includes projects operating during the school year and the summer school recess. The out-of-school program provides economically deprived school dropouts with practical work experience and on-the-job training. These activities aim to encourage them to resume their formal education, if possible, and to help them acquire work habits and attitudes that will improve their employability or enhance their participation in specific skill training. The enrollee jobs provide experience and training for upward job mobility.

A wide variety of job opportunities is offered to enrollees; however, jobs involved in the construction, operation, or maintenance of any facility used or intended to be used for religious or sectarian worship are prohibited. Also, NYC enrollees must not displace employed workers nor impair existing contracts for service.

Operation Mainstream — is a program administered by the Department of Labor, Bureau of Work Programs (BWP) under the Economic Opportunity Act (Title II, Sec. 205(d)) which authorizes grants for projects (1) which involve activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age or otherwise, to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs, (2) which, in addition to other servies provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment of beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation, activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands, and (3) which are conducted in accordance with standards adequate to assure application of those policies under the Act designed for the protection of employed workers and for maintenance of basic rates of pay and other suitable conditions of employment.

Projects may include: improvement and beautification of parks and open spaces in low income neighborhoods; improvement and rehabilitation of community facilities, including those utilized for health, senior citizens' social services, and recreation; maintenance, improvement and protection of forests and wildlife areas, roadside beautification, and National, State, and local park facilities; social health, and educational services for the poor; rehabilitation of homes and centers for the aged poor; and, elimination of water and air pollution.

New Careers — the Economic Opportunity Act (Title II, Sec. 205(e)) authorizes the New Careers Program which provides grants to or agreements - contracts - with any state or local agency or private organization to pay all or part of the costs of adult work-training employment programs for unemployed, low-income persons involving activities designed to improve the physical, social, economic or cultural conditions of the community or area served in fields including, but not limited to, health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety. Such projects must (1) assist in the development of entry level employment opportunities; (2) provide maximum prospects for advancement; and (3) be combined with necessary educational, training, counseling, and transportation assistance, and such other supportive services as may be needed. A major objective of this program is to contribute to and facilitate the process of designing, creating, and filling new career jobs in public service, either in the civil services or in private nonprofit agencies, as support or sub-professional personnel.

Major emphasis is to be placed on the creation of "New Career" jobs in established institutions which provide a public service. Some such job classifications are already established as support-sub-professional personnel in certain Federally financed programs such as education aides, health aides and casework aides, but they are not being widely utilized by some of the older, more traditional institutions. Other such job classifications have been long established in municipal and state governments but are closed to the poor because of their inability to pass written tests or to meet academic and other standards which are not necessary to acceptable levels of job performance.

Special Impact Program — is administered by the Department of Labor to provide employment programs for youths and adults in large urban and rural areas with sizeable concentrations of low-income persons. Contracts for project sponsorship can be made with the Federal Government, public, private nonprofit, and profit-making organizations.

These special programs are: (1) designed to deal with the critical socio-economic problems existing in particular communities and neighborhoods within these areas; (2) of sufficient size and scope to diminish the tendencies of these neighborhoods and communities toward dependency, chronic unemployment and rising community tensions; and (3) where possible, part of a city-wide plan for the reorganization of local or state agencies to coordinate all relevant programs of social development.

The act requires evidence that wherever possible, work training or employment opportunities are filled by residents of the communities or neighborhoods served and that the activities pursued are carried out in these same areas. Federal funding under these special impact programs is limited to 90 percent of a local project's costs. These projects can include capital investment activity by private organizations with the Federal share not exceeding 90 percent of such an investment.

Priority is given to projects which: are an integral part of an overall comprehensive manpower effort for residents of the neighborhood; provide essential supportive and other related services, in conjunction with other planned or on-going activities, which might not otherwise be available for training neighborhood residents; demonstrate optimum functional program linkage with all other manpower and related neighborhood conservation, rehabilitation, and development activities planned or operating in the neighborhood; provide for maximum participation of neighborhood residents in the implementation of the project, including the hiring of such residents for jobs created by the project; provide employment opportunities, in activities involving major improvements in the physical and social environment of the neighborhood.

Work Experience and Training — under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act provides for programs designed to help unemployed parents and other needy persons prepare for regular employment in a competitive labor market. Priority in the program is given to parents of families receiving AFDC.

The Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under Sec. 261 of the MDTA, cooperate in the administration of these activities which include: pretraining services and basic maintenance, health, family and day care, and similar services, basic education, testing, counseling, occupational training, both OJT and institutional, job referral and follow-up services.

Through agreements with appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies, the program provides work experience to the extent required to assist participants in developing necessary work attitudes or to prepare them for work or training involving the acquisition of needed skills.

U.S. Employment Service — Through its Human Resources Development Program the U.S. Employment Service and its affiliated state agencies utilize an individualized, case-by-case approach to reach the hard-core unemployed and the underemployed in specific communities and areas within communities for the purpose of assisting them, in every way possible, to become suitably employed. This program is designed to benefit persons who are severely handicapped in seeking employment because of race, national origin, physical handicap, prison record, age, lack of education, and other problems.

Services offered include: (1) special counseling to determine needs; (2) planning individual programs to include an array of needed manpower services; (3) development of employment opportunities commensurate with abilities; (4) job counseling and selective placement for handicapped persons; (5) supportive "on-the-job" and follow-up services.

Major techniques used are:

(1) Outreach — seeking out the disadvantaged where they live or where they congregate, as on street corners.

(2) Employability improvement — a thorough appraisal of the individual

and the development of a plan of action for him. The plan may include testing, counseling, basic education, medical examination and care, and referral to work experience, to occupational training and/ or to a suitable job.

(3) Job development and placement — individual job development and referral, involving encouraging employers to modify hiring specifications and to develop career ladders for current staff, thereby creating job opportunities at the entry level.

(4) Job market information — developing and using manpower data to identify available job opportunities, to assess the number and characteristics of clients to be served, to provide job seekers with information on the nature, location, and requirements of jobs, and to provide employers with information on the characteristics of job seekers. Job market information will also serve agencies cooperating in manpower programs.

The U.S. Employment Service operates through affiliated employment security agencies in every state, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands and American Samoa. Each state agency has prepared a Human Resources Development plan showing how the program will be implemented in its jurisdiction and in which communities and target areas.

Employment Service personnel coordinate their activities with other concerned agencies by referring clients to Job Corps; to Neighborhood Youth Corps; to MDTA training; to the Special Impact Program; to Adult Basic Education; to the local vocational rehabilitation agency: in short, to any appropriate manpower program. They cooperate with neighborhood outreach personnel of other agencies and organizations, such as Community Action Agencies, to identify and assist potential manpower program clients. The employment service agencies station personnel in multi-purpose neighborhood centers, as well, to provide a wide range of manpower information services.

What We Have Learned This Far

All the programs in our set of manpower development tools are comparatively new and we are still very much in the learning stage — at least we hope we are learning. The oldest of the programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act, the Neighborhood Youth Corps and Operation Mainstream, have been in operation for nearly three years, and the newer programs authorized by the 1966 amendments began operating this summer.

The MDTA of 1962, which was the first of these major manpower programs, has a somewhat longer history. But the program's emphasis and approach have been changed so much because of the steady rise in overall economic activity during its operating life that MDTA today differs considerably from MDTA in the beginning.

In its first years, while the economy was still rather slack, MDTA participants, for the most part, were persons who, while unemployed, had some history of participation in the labor force, and had the basic educational background to absorb skill training with no further preparation.

More recently, as the economy has come closer to full employment, emphasis in MDTA has shifted in the direction of enrolling the disadvantaged. These include persons who may not be so highly motivated, may not have the basic educational attainment to benefit from skill training, and may lack any previous meaningful work experience.

Such groups, of course, have largely comprised the target population of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act.

This recent emphasis on the disadvantaged and marginal members of the labor force has had a profound impact on such traditional public institutions as the Employment Services and the schools, particularly the vocational schools. For example, MDTA training has required vocational educators, who have traditionally focused their efforts on high school graduating classes, to concern themselves with reaching the school dropouts and the undereducated — groups they had previously not encountered.

Efforts to reach these groups have brought about the creation of a new institution — the MDTA Skill Center — which combines under one roof counseling, basic education, prevocational training, a wide selection of occupational and skill training, and job placement services. The need for identifying trainable unemployed workers and trainable occupations with "reasonable expectations of employment" has had real impact on the operations of the state employment services and has led them to develop new approaches such as their Youth Opportunities Centers and Human Resources Development Program which include a new emphasis on finding the unemployed, recruiting them, and steering them into jobs or training. We are dealing increasingly with the lowest margin of the labor force which offers us an opportunity along with the obvious problems it creates. The opportunity lies in the fact that every member of this group that can be successfully placed in stable employment represents a real benefit to the individual and sizeable potential savings to the society.

We think we are doing a reasonably good job. On the basis of several studies we know that persons completing MDTA training enjoy greater employment stability than before. We know they have better jobs. Most of the graduates before training had a history of marginal employment — after graduation, they have usually been able to successfully compete for jobs paying at least the minimum acceptable standard in the trade. We know their earnings have increased —

through January 1967 the median pretraining earnings of employed MDTA completors was $1.44 an hour; after training the median rose to $1.74. Over a working lifetime this is a very large difference and reflects a much larger contribution to the economy than these workers might otherwise have made.

We know that the other manpower programs are also having an effect. For example, we know that for youths leaving the NYC out-of-school program for program-related reasons, about 31 percent left for unsubsidized employment and about 19 percent more went back to school or on to some other training program. That's half. Taken alone the figure is not impressive. But, considering that we are dealing with a group at the bottom margin — a group which every other institution in society has failed — it is not a figure that I will apologize for. It is a figure I hope to improve.

If the question is, are these programs worth more than they cost, I can demonstrate that the answer is obviously yes. If the question is, are we going as well as we could, I must admit the answer is no.

One of the most obvious needs for change is the need to coordinate these programs, to link them up, to feed workers completing one into another, to rationalize their administration, and to think beyond next week into next year. This brings to mind a dirty word — Planning. But, we think it is necessary, so we are going to try to plan.

CEP, CAMPS, and the Model Cities Program

As the previous discussion indicates, the Department of Labor administers a variety of programs, with varying and substantially undetermined effectiveness, aimed at meeting the needs indicated by universe of need and the slum surveys. In recent months we have felt a pressing need to rationalize the administration of these programs and coordinate their operation. Several mechanisms for doing this and tying in the related programs of other agencies which are inextricably bound to efforts to break the poverty cycle have recently been devised and put into operation by the Department of Labor and the other agencies involved. These mechanisms — the Human Resources Development Program mentioned earlier, the Concentrated Employment Program and the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System — tie into the Model City Program and hopefully will provide a system which will allow us to operate these programs as a planned and integrated whole, rather than as independent fragments. If we can make these systems work, their total impact should be much larger than the sum of their parts.

The Concentrated Employment Program — While the Human Resourses Development Service delivers all the manpower "client services" needed to help unemployed and underemployed individuals become employable and suitably employed, the Concentrated Employment Program provides the resources for staff, actual training and all other services needed to make a substantial impact on neighborhoods characterized by severe manpower problems. As a response to the conditions revealed by the slum surveys conducted in the fall of 1966, the Concentrated Employment Program was launched in April 1967, by the Department of Labor, in cooperation with the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In fiscal 1967 the CEP was directed at selected target areas in 20 cities and two rural areas, where $100 million from the spectrum of Labor-administered programs has been concentrated to provide a variety of manpower services to some 70,000 severely disadvantaged ghetto residents during a 12-month period. The FY 1968 budget calls for the program to expand to serve about 150,000 persons in 69 additional cities and six rural areas, at a cost of $285 million. The Concentrated Employment Program will be tied to the Model Cities program as closely as possible.

The CEP Concept

The program was designed to: (1) combine under one sponsor and in a single contract all the manpower programs and services necessary to move an individual from unemployability and dependency to self-sufficiency; and (2) to facilitate the delivery of such services by funding through a single source. As a matter of policy, sponsorship of a concentrated employment program is presumed to lie with the local Community Action Agency as the most effective agent for coordination at the local level. The delivery of manpower services lies with the State Employment Service agency through the Human Resources Development Program. Cooperative agreements have been worked out to implement these policies at the National and local levels.

Basically, the CEP effort involves refocusing and linking several major programs authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Economic Opportunity Act. The CEP utilizes the resources of the following programs: (1) MDTA training for disadvantaged groups with the necessary supportive services, (2) NYC with increasing emphasis on training at the work site for out-of-school youth, combined where needed with basic literacy and other education and training, (3) New Careers, (4) Operation Mainstream, and (5) the Special Impact Program.

Program Design

Typically a CEP will include these components:

(1) A central intake and orientation center, easily accessible to area residents, where registration, counseling and testing, development of individual employability plans, and orientation will be provided, and from which participants will be referred to work and training programs or to permanent jobs. The center will also offer supportive services.

(2) Intensive, agressive, and concerted outreach and recruitment among the target population.

(3) Individual employability planning, developed for each participant including all the steps necessary for total preparation for work.

(4) Job orientation with instruction in grooming, health habits, job hunting, budgeting, consumer education and work attitudes.

(5) Continuous counseling and coaching including coaching during the first stages of permanent employment so that at every point along the way to stabilized employment, the individual is given the support he needs in order to succeed.

(6) Training, work experience, and basic and vocational education programs adequate to meet the needs of the target population.

(7) Linked medical, social and other services operating in or near the target areas. Servicing agencies are encouraged to outstation personnel at CEP centers or nearby facilities to provide services and expedite referral for such services.

(8) Job development and placement services for those who are immediately ready for employment and for those who have received the required services. Emphasis is placed on the development of permanent, unsubsidized job opportunities in the private sector.

(9) Post-employment follow-up and recycling of those who fail to adjust to their jobs.

One concept basic to the CEP approach is "no dropouts." If a participant is unsuccessful in one phase of the program, he will be worked with, coached, and encouraged to enroll in some other phase.

These program components are to be linked and coupled so that participants move from one service to the next in a smooth flow, with sufficient flexibility built into the operation to allow for individual adjustments. The effective application of this "continuous flow" concept will contribute immeasurably to the successful implementation of the CEP.

To a considerable extent, attaining CEP's major objectives will depend on the extensive and effective participation of business and industry in the programs. The skills, the technology, the ingenuity, and the drive of American industry must be brought to bear on the alleviation of hard-core unemployment. Thus, private industry will be involved in planning the program and will serve, in many instances, as contractors and sub-contractors for its implementation. As the program matures and we learn a little more we hope other ways will be found to use the vast and badly needed resources of the business community.

CEP – A Delivery System

CEP is the most effective system yet developed to delivery manpower programs at the local level. It brings together in one place everything necessary for a successful area manpower program. We hope that single funding with a single sponsor will result in:

(1) Better service to the individual and a higher success rate.

(2) Better control of Federal programs and improvement in achievement of program goals and objectives.

(3) Elimination of confusion and difficulty for local government officials in operating manpower programs.

(4) Improved coordination at the local levels of all employment and employment related resources.

The Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System

While the Concentrated Employment Program focuses on specific target areas, the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System was designed to accomplish the same objective of concerted services on a city-wide, state-wide and nation-wide basis.

Beginning with the current fiscal year, the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS) provides a means for coordinating the manpower activities of the several agencies of the Manpower Administration; the Office of Education and the Social and Rehabilitation Services in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Office of Economic Opportunity; the Economic Development Administration in the Department of Commerce; and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. We hope that other manpower-related programs supported by Federal funds, as well as local government, private industry and other interested parties will become involved in the CAMPS process to promote planning and implementation of programs on a more comprehensive scale.

CAMPS is national in scope, providing cooperating agencies at the national, regional, state, and selected area levels an opportunity to talk together about manpower problems, programs, and activities and their impact on agreed-upon goals. It is a vehicle for systematic exchange of information among agencies about resources and a means for rational interrelation of responsibilities for providing manpower services. Its benefits include increasing the number of persons served and expediting the provision of necessary services.

In sixty-seven metropolitan areas, representatives of the participating agencies have formed manpower coordinating committees to assess the manpower needs of the area and allocate resources accordingly. Plans for these metropolitan areas have been incorporated into comprehensive state manpower plans by coordinating committees at the state levels, who supplement and consolidate plans for those parts of the state not included in the 67 metropolitan area plans. Regional Coordinating Committees have been set up to review and approve state plans in light of national goals and guidelines, provide technical assistance to the states within the region, provide assistance in jointly obtaining the use of available funds by participating agencies and evaluate approved manpower programs to determine whether goals are being achieved and what adjustments are required. The National Coordinating Committee is designed to develop overall direction for CAMPS, including national manpower goals and guidelines based on anticipated economic developments and manpower needs for the coming fiscal year, to review the operation of the system and recommend ways for improving coordination, and to plan the greatest possible use of cooperative funding arrangements.

The comprehensive manpower plans for FY 1968, as developed under the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System, were based on budget requests for FY 1968, as submitted to Congress early this year. Amendments to the plans will be made, where necessary, upon receipt of appropriations and when conditions change in local manpower needs.

As the CAMPS system is perfected, it will become an integral part of the Department of Labor program planning and budgeting system. This comprehensive approach to manpower programming focuses a closer relationship among the various program agencies and closer program linkages at the local level, in spite of differing legal and administrative procedures. In addition, CAMPS plans will provide administrators at each level with program information which should indicate how services to slum residents can be improved by altering program emphasis, adjusting program levels, or introducing new programs to fill the gaps left by existing programs. For example, extensive health services may be necessary to increase enrollments and successful performance in manpower training programs. On the other hand, a specific city could possibly more effectively utilize a larger number and greater variety of occupational training projects than more extensive health or other services. Of particular interest for the Model Cities Program are the area CAMPS plans, which will provide local planners and administrators with information on available Federal manpower resources.

Department of Labor Participation in the Model Cities Program

The Department of Labor is fully committed to the Model Cities Program and will play the major role in the manpower aspects of the program. Manpower Administration representatives will be assigned to each city and will be responsible for helping the city during the planning phase.

Manpower planning for the Model Cities program will involve coordination of the effort already established through CAMPS, and concentration on specific target groups and areas by means of the Concentrated Employment and Human Resources Development programs. CEP, with its emphasis on a single contract and the Employment Service as the prime deliverer of manpower services, will provide the major input of the Department of Labor in the Model Cities Program. In small cities or in cities where a Concentrated Employment Program or Human Resources Development program has already been established, redirection of existing programs and staff resources may suffice.

Manpower components for Model Cities will, to the maximum extent possible, be planned and implemented through the Concentrated Employment Program. The CAMPS area committee will plan the use of resources in a way that facilitates and complements the Model Cities Program by relating the CEP resources to other resources available to the community. Where supplemental funds are not available, the area CAMPS committee will plan the redirection of existing resources to provide a manpower component for Model City neighborhood. Through the CAMPS machinery as well as through the CEP, resources will be brought together from a variety of sources and given central direction and emphasis designed to suit the particular configuration of needs in the neighborhood, with built-in flexibility for experimentation and program modification.

The Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System and the Concentrated Employment Program are planned to implement a manpower component for the Model City Program in the following ways:

(1) The Model Cities employment goal, "Employment of Model Neighborhood residents in suitable jobs and at decent wage rates at levels comparable to the level prevailing in the local or regional labor market," is identical to that of the CEP and CAMPS.

(2) Interagency coordination to promote linkages in planning and operating programs is a primary goal of all three.

(3) Comprehensive planning for Model Cities for the first-year plan as well as the five-year plan will be facilitated by CAMPS which can plan manpower programs a year in advance and encompass Model City planning.

(4) Innovation and demonstration, primary characteristics of the Model City Program, are also stressed in the CEP and CAMPS. The CEP and CAMPS plans can be modified at any time to make them more relevant to current needs. The CEP monthly reporting system is

expected to provide data on the basis of which modifications can be made and the effectiveness of this new approach can be considered. In this way, even the most successful projects can be improved.

(5) Innovation in interagency relationships and administrative procedures are central to all three.

(6) Program information at all levels to inform the sponsor and program administrators about the resources available and provide them with the basis for altering program direction to meet current needs is a feature of all three.

(7) Involvement of public and private sources to give the program across-the-board support is a feature of all three.

(8) High impact on specific target populations is a primary goal of all three.

Through the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System, the Concentrated Employment Program and Human Resources Development program, the Department of Labor and cooperating agencies have the tools to develop manpower components envisioned by the Model City Program. We look forward to adapting these tools to the different problems which exist in the deprived neighborhoods which are the target of the Model Cities Program.

PREFERRED VERSUS CALCULATED RISK

Thomas J. Brown
Assistant to the President
Polaroid Corporation

In most discussions of business and industry involvement in providing jobs for the underprivileged or marginally qualified, there are many answers but usually many more questions.

At the Polaroid Corporation we have, because of the influence of our President, been involved in developing latent talents in as many members of our corporate community as we possibly could. We have been doing this for years, and our most fruitful effort was what we called "Project 60," a program designed to enable production line workers to transfer to technical training programs, and develop as their latent talents and careful, concerned supervision would enable them to go. Some of the people who went through this program originally are now highly skilled, well-paid members in our company and work conscientiously to help newcomers to the company realize that our company-sponsored education and training courses, plus the many academic courses that are available in the Greater Boston community, are there for their growth and development, and they should be used.

Polaroid's success indicates that well-planned employer initiative, without any outside influence, can build a strong company that grows from within. Other companies are following our example and have been for years. In some instances it has been possible to develop people with marginal skills initially, into management positions through the use of tuition refund programs, training programs, and exposure to areas that would not normally be open to non-degree-holding people.

There are many programs in existence today that are funded with municipal and federal monies to provide training for marginally skilled people. Many of the programs are wasteful, many of them are only productive in a limited way. Part of the reason is that the level of competence and dedication of the people running the programs is inadequate. Add to that the lack of communication between the political and social elements and you have the formula for marginal productivity. How do we correct this situation and eliminate the wanton waste of tax dollars and precious time? One of the first things that we have to do is to demand greater use of the talents in the business community. We have very little time in which to make socio-economic adjustments. This summer's bursts of outrage by people in socially depressed communities throughout the country was one of the obvious and disastrous warnings of what can happen when people become frustrated, disillusioned, and misled in the midst of a tremendously affluent society.

The private sector in Greater Boston is doing, and has been doing their job irrespective of federal programs. One of our neighboring firms in Cambridge, KLH Research & Development Corporation, is in the forefront when it comes to training people with minimal skills and giving them every opportunity to advance. To encourage regular attendance and an uninterrupted training schedule, KLH has set up a Child Development Center. Preschool children accompany their working parents to the nearby Center in the morning. After a day of programmed education and play the healthy, well-fed youngsters are picked up by the parent — usually the mother.

Our present concern in Boston is that the Core city is located quite a distance from the suburban companies that are hiring, paying good salaries, and offering the best opportunities for advancement. These areas are not now served by public transportation, nor do people traveling to these jobs for interviews feel that it is really worth the effort. They still labor under the concept of "last hired--first fired," and it appears to them that in spite of the "Equal Opportunity Employer" signs they will be laid off from these suburban well-paying jobs if anything should happen.

We have two problems here — one of transportation, and one of a negative mental attitude on the part of the people whom industry, in many instances, is anxious to attract and hold. Since efforts to attract people to the suburban areas have failed, our next logical step in Greater Boston has been to bring industry into the socially depressed community. We have been talking and planning for two years about ways to bring assembly and light manufacturing industries into the Roxbury and South End communities of Boston. Recently we have been able to use existing community organizations, such as Opportunities Industrialization Center, that provide vestibule training to upgrade below-level skills in reading, arithmetic, grammar, household budgeting, and Negro history, plus the proper attitudes towards getting to a job on time and performing to the best of one's ability.

The first problem that the business community conjured for themselves, and I use the word "conjured" advisedly. is they felt that unless they had a concensus of the Negro leadership in the community, then it would be neither practical nor feasible for them to set up an industrial operations using marginally qualified people from the surrounding area. Much of this fear has been dispelled and companies are now developing products and subsystems that can be manufactured with light machinery in clean, well-run ghetto establishments. The difficulty that followed was the one of selecting a staff to run these operations. It has to be clear at the outset that any company coming into a community such as we are describing must have a reasonable complement of Negroes on their instructional force in order not to alienate the people in the community.

The next problem that we at Polaroid had, as well as many of the other companies who are planning such ventures, is the job of selecting production trainees for these jobs. I mentioned earlier that Opportunities Industrialization Center would channel the students who have undergone vestibule training into the companies for trainee jobs. Other organizations in the Greater Boston communities, such as Jobs Clearing House, pre-screen applicants before they are sent to OIC. OIC, in turn, transfers the students to good paying productive jobs in the newly established or relocated companies.

The role that private industry plays becomes crucial at this point. They must be sure of two things: First, they must pick the management for this subsidiary operation with extreme care as to personality and technical competence; secondly, they must be willing to provide real support in all phases of the pilot operation, from cost accounting to engineering. The privy information that companies can give to support potential Negro supervisors and managers in the community is necessary to insure the success of this kind of program. It is anticipated that at some point in the near future the technical support given by the companies will have "rubbed off" on the Negro staff members with whom they have been working.

It is hoped that the merchandise produced in these so-called ghetto industries will be consumer-oriented products. The pride that generates from a consumer product made in this environment is immeasurable. I doubt, however, that the assembly of a canvas tent or an electronic system designed to go to the moon will excite the same pride of participation because the average Negro's first interest is self-improvement — getting to the moon can wait. An approach that is being taken by another firm in Greater Boston is to educate the new recruits in the Opportunities Industrialization Center vestibule training program mornings, and produce quality merchandise afternoons until prepared for a full work day. This method reduces the length of time required for the new recruit to start taking home a pay check.

The time-consuming problem area in this manufacturing/training concept is the one of counseling. The recruits must be given the proper guidance, encouragement, discipline, and motivation — all compatible with their individual ability to absorb.

As leaders in your communities I urge you to use the same kinds of persuasion on the business community now that is used on them when you are running for political office or raising campaign funds. If every city had a Mayor Lindsay or Cervantes who could identify, describe, and then move to correct social problems, I could have spent this time explaining how to make a Model Cities program succeed or how to develop a People Renewal Program. But I must ask you to organize the business sector to assume their responsibility. It is also imperative that you as elected officials offer the guidance and the support of the community services, including health, education, welfare, and police, not to mention food inspection, housing inspection, and all of the other departments which could do a more effective job in easing ghetto tensions. After all, what good is it for an industry to invest a million dollars in renovating a plant, installing equipment, and setting up a manufacturing operation in a socially depressed area if the police department does not have a thorough human relations training program for its men. The connection is simply this: What if a patrolman who has not learned his human relation ABC's uses profane language or clubs a Negro unnecessarily and triggers a social disturbance such as we had this summer? All of your efforts and mine are wasted. What is required then, and I cannot repeat this too often, is a closer coordination between City Hall, City Departments, and the industrial leaders who are looking for your support but who are lost without your assurance that they have it.

I think that more could be done effectively by those of us in private industry and municipalities if we did not sit and wait for our mutual uncle to come and do it for us. Show me a successful business in this country and I'll show them how to operate needed socio-economic programs just as effectively as they operate their business. Better, in fact, because there is a clearer ethical and moral climate in which to work. We do it at Polaroid, and other companies do it throughout the country daily.

My only caution at this point is that many times a company will develop an idea and before it is fully thought out and before it has had some market research done on it, it is publicized front page with all the attendant fanfare. Weeks and often months later the results are meager because not enough people did their share to anticipate the problems that could develop. The desire to gain premature publicity for innovative company programs is disastrous for the firm and discouraging to the people in the community who really want and need your support. If you must publicize your programs, please do so after you get results.

If I had my way I would urge you to start tomorrow and encourage the industries in your area to embark on a three-part program. The first phase for a company locating a subsidiary operation in a socially depressed community would be to locate, pre-qualify, train and hire people with marginal skills, and pay them while learning. The second phase would be to put these recruits, male and female, into meaningful production work, turning out consumer goods that are advertised, recognizable, and in which they can have some measure of pride and indentity. The third phase would be to train supervisors and managers of these businesses so that ultimately these firms could be turned over on a long-term sale agreement to members of the Negro community to run and operate as their own private businesses. The role of the company would not end with phase three. You could urge the companies to continue to use this newly formed company as their subcontractor. The newly formed company could also seek out and produce components and merchandise for other companies in the area. A strong, self-sustaining Negro-owned industry would emerge that could be supported with technical assistance and subcontracts by any number of industries. The companies who are eager to get started and who by themselves do not have what they regard as consumer-oriented products could form a group to raise enough money for a group of Negro businessmen to start a company. In addition to providing long-term loan money to this group, practical support would be loaned to the new company. It would include cost accountants, systems and personnel analysts, inventory experts, market research people, engineers, technicians, advertising people, legal staffs, professional and all of the other experts among this group of companies who could contribute to the success of such a venture.

I do not have to tell you about the ethics of this situation — they are extremely delicate. There are people who traditionally have tried to help a company get started and then ultimately ended up owning the company. We should bend over backwards to avoid that kind of ethical misdemeanor. We should do the same thing when it comes to property acquisition and site selection to be sure that no-one in a politically powerful position just happens to own the property. Nothing sours the unsophisticated inhabitants of the ghetto any more than realizing that they are being taken once again.

We started by giving you a choice of a preferred risk or a calculated risk. What has been described here in the way of offering financial and technical support to the socially depressed community is what I regard as a preferred risk, one that should be taken immediately and one that should be spread nation-wide.

The other choice is the calculated risk which I think all of us take when we assume that being white gives us all of the right answers and insulates us automatically from being suspect, making mistakes, perpetuating all of the social problems that were mentioned earlier, and in effect creating the atmosphere in which personal outrage suddenly explodes against the white establishment. That is the calculated risk that I trust we do not take.

THE PROVISION OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Professor James S. Coleman
Department of Social Relations
Johns Hopkins University

I want to focus attention on a general concept or idea, and the way in which that concept, as held by people in society, has changed over recent history, and is likely to change in the future. That concept is "equality of educational opportunity." What has it meant in the past, what does it mean now, and what will it mean in the future? Whose obligation is it to provide such equality? What are some ways in which it can be provided? But first of all, and above all, what is and has been meant in society by the idea of equality of educational opportunity?

In the United States, from the beginning, the concept of educational opportunity, for whites, was a concept of equality of opportunity. Both the absence of a legitimate class structure in the United States, and the need to provide a common integrating experience, a "melting pot," for immigrants from diverse backgrounds, led away from a differentiated system, and toward a common school.

But the concept of equality of educational opportunity held then was itself a special concept. Equality of opportunity meant several things:

1. Providing a free education up to a given level which constituted the principal entry point to the labor force.
2. Providing a common curriculum for all children, regardless of background.
3. Partly by design and partly because of low population density, providing that children from diverse backgrounds attend the same school.
4. Providing equality within a given locality, since local taxes provided the source of support for schools.

This conception of equality of opportunity is that which is still held by many persons; but there are some assumptions in it which are not obvious . First, it implicitly assumes that the existence of free schools eliminates economic sources of inequality of opportunity. But free schools do not mean that the costs of a child's education become reduced to zero for families at all economic levels. When free education was introduced, many families could not afford it beyond an early age of the child. His labor was necessary to the family — whether in rural or urban areas. Even after the passage of child labor laws, this remained true on the farm. These economic sources of inequality of opportunity have become small indeed — up through secondary education; but at one time, they were a major source of inequality, and in some countries, they remain so; and certainly, for higher education, they remain so.

A second assumption implied by this concept of equality of opportunity is that opportunity lay in exposure to a given curriculum. The amount of opportunity is then measured in terms of the level of curriculum to which the child is exposed. The higher the curriculum made available to a given set of children, the greater their opportunity.

The most interesting point about both these assumptions is the relatively passive role of the school and community, relative to the child's role. The school's obligation was to "provide an opportunity" by being available, within easy geographic access of the child, free of cost — beyond the value of the child's time — and with a curriculum that would not exclude him from higher education. The obligation to "use the opportunity" was on the child or the family, so that his role was defined to be the active one, with the responsibility for achievement upon him. Despite the fact that the school's role was the relatively passive one and the child's or family's role the active one, the use of this social service soon came to be no longer a choice of the parent or child, but that of the state, through passage of compulsory attendance laws. These laws began in the 19th century, and have been periodically revised upward in age.

This concept of equality of educational opportunity is one that has been implicit in most educational practice throughout most of the period of public education in the 19th and 20th centuries. However, there have been several challenges to it, serious questions raised by new conditions in public education. The first of these in the United States was a challenge to the assumption of a common curriculum, and it occurred in the early years of the 20th century with the expansion of secondary education. Until the report of the committee of the National Education Association issued in 1918, standard curriculum in secondary schools had been a classical one, college preparatory, appropriate for the college entrance which lay ahead of most of the school's graduates. But then as there came a massive influx of non-college bound adolescents into the high school, this curriculum changed into one appropriate for the new majority. This is not to say it changed immediately in any schools, nor that all schools changed equally, but rather that the seven cardinal principles became a powerful influence in the movement toward a less academically rigid curriculum. The introduction of the new nonclassical curriculum was seldom if ever couched in terms of a conflict between those for whom high school was college preparation, and those for whom it was terminal education; nevertheless, this is what it was. The "inequality" was the use of a curriculum that served a minority and was not designed to fit the needs of the majority; and the shift of curriculum was intended to fit the curriculum to the needs of the new majority in the schools.

The next stage in the evolution of the idea of equality of educational opportunity came as a result of challenges to the basic concept from opposing directions; The southern states in the United States, in the face of Negro demands for equality of opportunity, devised the concept of "separate but equal." And the Supreme Court countered this with the doctrine that legal separation by race inherently constitutes inequality of opportunity. Thus the southern states challenged assumption 3 of the original concept, the assumption that equality depended on the opportunity to attend the same school. This challenge was, however, consistent with the overall logic of the original concept, for the idea of attendance at the same school was not really part of the logic. The logic, or inherent idea, was that opportunity resided in exposure to a curriculum, and the community's responsibility was to provide that exposure, the child's to take advantage of it.

It was the pervasiveness of this underlying idea which created the difficulty for the Supreme Court. It was evident that even when identical facilities and identical teacher salaries existed for racially separate schools, "equality of educational opportunity" in some sense did not exist. But the source of this inequality remained an unarticulated feeling. In the decision of the Supreme Court, this unarticulated feeling began to take form. The essence of it was that the *effects* of such separate schools were, or were likely to be, different. Thus the concept of equality of opportunity which focused on effects of schooling began to take form. The actual decision of the court was in fact a confusion of two unrelated premises: this new concept, which looked at results of schooling, and the legal premise that the use of race as a basis for school assignment violates fundamental freedoms. But what is important for the evolution of this concept of equality of opportunity is that a new and different assumption was introduced — the assumption that equality of opportunity depends in some fashion upon effects of schooling. I believe the decision would have been more soundly based had it not depended on the effects of schooling, but only on the violation of freedom; but by so doing it brought into the open the implicit goals of equality of educational opportunity — that is, goals having to do with the *results* of school — to which the original concept was somewhat awkwardly directed. That these goals were in fact behind the concept can be verified by a simple mental experiment: suppose the early schools had operated for only one hour a week, attended by children of all social classes. This would have met the explicit assumptions of the early concept of equality of opportunity, since the school is free, with a common curriculum, and attended by all children in the locality. But it obviously would not have been accepted, even at that time, as providing equality of opportunity, because its effects would have been so minimal. The additional educational resources provided by middle and upper class families, whether in the home, by tutoring, or in private supplementary schools, would have created severe inequalities in results.

Thus the dependence of the concept upon results or effects of schooling which had lain hidden until 1954, came partially into the open with the Supreme Court decision. Yet this was not the end, for it created more problems than it solved. It might allow one to assess gross inequalities, such as that created by dual school systems in the south, or by a system like that in the mental experiment I just described. But it allows nothing beyond that. Even more confounding, since the decision did not use effects of schooling as a criterion of inequality, but only as justification for a criterion of racial integration, then integration itself emerged as the basis for still a new concept of equality of educational opportunity. Thus the idea of effects of schooling as an element in the concept was introduced, but immediately overshadowed by another, the criterion of racial integration.

The next stage in the evolution of this concept was, I believe, the Office of Education Survey of Equality of Educational Opportunity. This survey was carried out under a mandate in the Civil Rights Act to the Commissioner of Education to assess the "lack of equality of educational opportunity" among racial and other groups in the United States. The evolution of this concept, and the existing disarray which this evolution had created, made the very definition of the task exceedingly difficult. The original concept could be examined by determining the degree to which all children in a locality had access to the same schools, and the same curriculum, free of charge. The existence of diverse secondary curricula appropriate to different futures could be assessed relatively easily. But the very assignment of a child to such a curriculum implies acceptance of the concept of equality which takes futures as given. And the introduction of the new ideas, equality as measured by results of schooling, and equality defined by racial integration, confounded the issue even further.

As a consequence, in planning the survey, it was obvious that no single concept of equality of educational opportunity existed; and that the survey must give information relevant to a variety of different concepts.

One of these was the traditional concept, with inequality defined in terms of differences of the community's input to the school, such as per pupil expenditure, school plants, libraries, quality of teachers, and other similar quantities. A second definition of inequality lay in the racial composition of the school, following the Supreme Court's decision that segregated schooling is inherently inequal. By the first of these two concepts, the question of inequality through segregation is excluded, while by the second, there is inequality of education within a school system so long as the schools within the system have different racial composition. Yet neither of these definitions give a suggestion of just how relevant any of these factors might be for school quality. Both are definitions of inequality in terms of resources provided in the school, with no attention to the relevance of these resources for learning. Two further concepts take exactly the opposite approach, looking at effects of school. The first of these may be defined in terms of consequences of the school for individuals with equal backgrounds and abilities. In this definition, equality of educational opportunity is equality of results, given the same individual input. With such a definition, inequality might come about either from differences in the school inputs or racial composition; but the test lies in the effects of these conditions.

The second type of inequality based on effects of school is defined in terms of consequences of the school for individuals of unequal backgrounds and abilities. In this definition, equality of educational opportunity is equality of results given different individual inputs. The most striking examples of inequality here would be children from households in which a language other than English, such as Spanish or Navaho, is spoken. Other examples would be low achieving children from homes in which there is a poverty of verbal expression or an absence of experiences which lead to conceptual facility.

Such a definition taken in the extreme would imply that equality of educational opportunity is reached only when the results of schooling, achievement and attitudes, are the same for the average member of racial and religious minorities as for the average member of the dominant group.

These were the various different conceptions of equality of opportunity taken by the survey. It was conceived as a pluralistic instrument, given the variety of ideas which had some claim of the concept of equality of opportunity in education. Yet I suggest that despite the avowed intention of not adjudicating between these different ideas, it has brought a new stage in the evolution of the concept. For the definitions of equality for which the survey was designed split sharply into two groups: The first two concerned input resources: first, those brought to the school by the actions of the school administration — facilities, curriculum, teachers; and second, those brought to the school by the other students, in the educational backgrounds which their presence contributed to the school. The last two definitions concerned the effects of schooling. Thus the dichotomy between inputs to school and effects of schooling divide these four definitions. When the report emerged, it did not give four different measures of equality, one for each of these definitions; but it did focus sharply on this dichotomy, giving in chapter 2 information on inequalities of input, relevant to definitions 4 and 5, and also in chapter 3, information on the relation of input to results, again relevant to definitions 4 and 5.

Though it is not directly relevant to our discussion here, it is interesting to note that this examination of the relation of school inputs to achievement results showed that it is precisely those input characteristics of schools that are most alike for Negroes and whites that are least effective for their achievement. Differences between schools attended by Negroes and those attended by whites were in the following increasing order: least, facilities and curriculum; next, teacher quality; and greatest, educational backgrounds of fellow students. This is precisely the same order of the effects of these characteristics on achievement of Negro students: facilities and curriculum least, teacher quality next, and backgrounds of fellow students, most.

By making the dichotomy between inputs and results explicit, and by focusing attention not only on inputs but on results, I suggest the Report brought into the open what had underlay all the ideas of equality of educational opportunity but had remained largely hidden: that the concept implied effective equality of opportunity, that is, equality in those elements that are effective for learning. The reason this had lay half hidden, obscured by definitions that involve inputs is, I suspect, because educational research has been, until recently, unprepared to demonstrate what elements are effective. The controversy that has surrounded the Report indicates that such measurement of effects are still subject to sharp disagreement; but the crucial point is that effects of inputs have come to constitute the basis for assessment of school quality and thus equality of opportunity, rather than the mere definition of particular inputs as being measures of quality for example, small classes are better than large, higher-paid teachers are better than lower-paid ones, by definition.

It would be fortunate indeed if the matter could be left to rest there; if merely by using effects of school rather than inputs as the basis for the concept, the problem were solved. But that is not the case at all. The conflict between definitions 4 and 5 given above shows that: This conflict can be shown more sharply by resorting again to the mental experiment discussed earlier, with a standard education of one hour per week, under identical conditions, for all children. By definition 4, controlling all background differences of the children, results for Negroes and whites would be equal, and thus by this definition, equality of opportunity would exist. But because such minimal schooling would have minimal effect, those children from educationally strong families would far outdistance others. And because such educationally strong backgrounds are found more often among whites than among Negroes, there would be very large overall Negro-white achievement differences, and thus inequality of opportunity by definition 5.

It is clear from this experiment that the problem of what constitutes equality of opportunity is not solved. The problem will become even clearer by showing graphs with some of the results of the survey. The highest line shows the achievement in verbal skills of whites in the urban northeast, at grades 1, 3, 6, 9, and 12. The second line shows the achievement at each of these grades of whites in the rural southeast. The third shows the achievement of Negroes in the urban northeast; and the fourth shows the achievement of Negroes in the rural southeast.

Considering the whites in the urban northeast as a comparison base for each of the other three groups, each shows a different pattern. The comparison with whites in the rural south shows two groups beginning near the same point in grade 1, and diverging over the years of school. The comparison with Negroes in the urban northeast shows two groups beginning farther apart at grade 1 and remaining about the same distance apart. The comparison with Negroes in the rural south shows two groups beginning far apart and moving much farther apart over the years of school.

Which of these charts shows equality of educational opportunity between regional and racial groups, if any does so? Which shows greatest inequality of opportunity? I think the second question is easier to answer than the first. The last comparison showing both initial difference and the greatest increase in difference over grades 1-12, appears the best candidate for greatest inequality. The first comparison, with whites in the rural south, also seems to show inequality of opportunity, because of the increasing difference over the 12 years. But what about the second comparison, with an approximately constant difference between Negroes and whites in the urban northeast? Is this equality of opportunity? I suggest that it is hardly so. It means, in effect, only that the period of school has left the average Negro at about the same level of achievement relative to whites as he began – that is in this case achieving higher than about 15 percent of the whites, lower than about 85 percent of the whites. It may well be that in the absence of school, those lines of achievement would have diverged, due to differences in home environments; or perhaps they would have remained an equal distance apart, as they are in this graph, though at lower levels of achievement for both groups, in the absence of school. If it were the former, we could say that school, by keeping the lines parallel, has been a force toward the equalization of opportunity. But in the absence of such knowledge, we cannot even say that.

What would full equality of educational opportunity look like in such graphs? One might persuasively argue that it should show a convergence, so that even though two population groups begin school with different levels of skills on the average, the average of the group that begins lower moves up to coincide with that of the group that begins higher. Parenthetically, I should note that this does not imply that all students' achievement comes to be identical, but only that the averages for two population groups that begin at different levels come to be identical. The diversity of individual scores could be as great as, or greater than, the diversity at grade 1.

Yet there are serious questions about this definition of equality of opportunity. It implies that over the period of school, there are no other influences, such as the family environment, which affect achievement over the 12 years of school, even though these influences may differ greatly for the two population groups. Concretely, it implies that white family environments, predominantly middle class, and Negro family environments, predominantly lower class, will produce no effects on achievement that would keep these averages apart. Such an assumption seems highly unrealistic, especially in view of the general importance of family background for achievement.

However, if such possibilities are acknowledged, then how far can they go before there is inequality of educational opportunity? Constant difference over school? Increasing differences?

The unanswerability of such questions begins to give a sense of a new concept of equality of educational opportunity because these questions concern the relative intensity of two sets of influences: those which are alike for the two groups, principally in school, and those which are different, such as those in the home or neighborhood. If the school's influences are not only alike for the two groups, but very strong, relative to the divergent influences, then the two groups will move together. If they are very weak, then they will move apart. Or more generally, the relative intensity of the convergent school influences and the divergent out-of-school influences determines the proximity of the educational system to providing equality of educational opportunity. In this perspective, complete equality of opportunity can only be reached if all the divergent out-of-school influences vanish, a condition that would arise only in the advent of boarding schools; given the existing divergent influences, equality of opportunity can only be approached and never fully reached. The concept becomes one of degree of proximity to equality of opportunity. This proximity is determined, then, not merely by the equality of educational inputs, but by the intensity of the school's influences, relative to the external divergent influences. That is, equality of output is not so much determined by equality of the resource inputs, but by the power of these resources in bringing about achievement.

This, then, I suggest is the place where the concept of equality of educational opportunity presently stands — an evolution that might have been anticipated a century and a half ago when the first such concepts arose, yet one which is very different from the concept as it first developed. This difference is sharpened if we examine a further implication of the current concept as I have described it. In describing the early concept, I indicated that the role of the community, and the educational institution, was a relatively passive one, that of providing a set of free public resources. The responsibility for profitable use of those resources lay with the child and his family. But the evolution of the concept has reversed these roles. The implication of the concept as I have described it above is that the responsibility to create achievement lies with the educational institution, not the child. The difference in achievement at grade 12 between the average Negro and the average white is, in effect, the degree of inequality of opportunity, and the reduction of that inequality is a responsibility of the school. This shift in responsibility follows logically from the shift of the concept of equality of opportunity from school resource inputs to effects of schooling. When that shift came about as it has in the past several years, the school's responsibility shifted from increasing its "quality" and equalizing the distribution of this "quality" to the quality of its students' achievements. Yet how is this responsibility to be realized? I suggest that it may be realized through a change in the very concept of the school itself, from the agency within which the child is taught, to the agent responsible for seeing that the child learns — a responsibility in which the school's own facilities may play only a small part.

The general idea is to conceive of the school very differently from the way we have done in the past — not as a building into which a child vanishes in the morning and from which he emerges in the afternoon, but as a "home base" that carries out some teaching functions but which serves principally to coordinate his activities, to perform guidance and testing, and to act as the child's "agent," in ways I will describe.

The essential aims of the elementary school, if the opportunity for further learning is not to be blocked, are the learning of only two things: reading and arithmetic. It is in teaching these basic skills that present schools most often fail for lower class children, and thus handicap them for further learning. Many new methods for teaching these subjects have been developed in recent years; and there is much interest of persons outside the schools in helping to solve the problem; yet the school is trapped by its own organizational weight — innovations cannot be lightly adopted by a massive educational system, and local arrangements that use community resources outside the school cannot easily be fitted into the school's organization. But if the school's role shifted from that of providing education to one of taking responsibility for the child's learning, many of these problems vanish. Under such a system, the teaching of elementary-level reading and arithmetic would be opened up to entrepreneurs outside the school, under contract with the school system to teach only reading or only arithmetic, and paid on the basis of increased performance by the child on standardized tests. The methods used by such contractors may only be surmised; the successful ones would presumably involve massive restructuring of the verbal or mathematical environment. The method might range from new phonetic systems for teaching reading or new methods for teaching numerical problem-solving to locally sponsored tutorial programs or the use of new technological aids such as talking typewriters and computer consoles. The payment-by-results would quickly eliminate the unsuccessful contractors, and the contractors would provide testing grounds for innovations that could subsequently be incorporated into the school.

One important element that this would introduce into schools is the possibility of parental choice. Each parent would have the choice of sending his child to any of the reading or arithmetic programs outside the school, on released time, or leaving him wholly within the school to learn his reading and arithmetic there. The school would find it necessary to compete with the system's external contractors to provide better education, and the parent could, for the first time in education, have the full privileges of consumer's choice. The school's responsibility would be to insure that the contractors were effective, to inform parents about their range of choice, and in effect to operate as an educational ombudsman.

One simple control would be necessary to insure that this did not lead to resegregation of the school along racial or class lines: no contractor could accept from any one school a higher proportion of whites than existed in that school, nor a higher proportion of students whose parents were above a certain educational level than existed in the school.

This means of opening up the school, through released time, private contractors, payment by results, and free choice for the consumer, could be easily extended to specific core subjects in high school. It should be a potentially profitable activity to the contractor, but with the profitability wholly contingent upon results, so that the incentives of these teachers and educational entrepreneurs are tied wholly to improving a child's achievement beyond the level that would otherwise be expected of him.

The use of released time and private contracts would be diversified in later years of school, so that a potential contractor could apply for a contract in any of a wide range of subjects, some presently taught within the school, but others not. The many post-high school business and technical schools that now exist would be potential contractors, but always with the public school establishing the criteria for achievement, testing the results, and acting as an agent for the consumer's interests.

It would still remain the case that the child would stay within the school for much of his time; and in those schools that stood up well to the external competition, most children would choose to take all their work in the school. At the same time, some schools might lose most of their teaching functions, if they did not deserve to keep them.

A second major way of opening up the school is directed wholly at the problem of racial and class integration, just as the first is directed wholly at the problem of achievement. The school would be opened up through intensifying the interactions between students who have different home-base schools. To create integrated schools in large urban centers becomes almost impossible; but to bring about social integration through schools is not. Again, the point is to discard the idea of the school as a closed institution, and think of it as a base of operations. Thus, rather than having classes scheduled in the school throughout the year, some classes would be scheduled with children from other schools, sometimes in their own school, sometimes in the other — but deliberately designed to establish continuing relationships between children across racial and social class lines. Certain extra-curricular activities can be organized on a cross-school basis, arranged to fit with the cross-school class schedules. Thus children from different home-base schools would not be competing against each other, but would be members of the same team or club. An intensified program of interscholastic activities, including debates and academic competitions as well as sports events, could achieve the aims of social integration — possibly not as fully as in the best integrated schools, but also possible even more so — and certainly more so than in many integrated schools.

This second means of opening up the school could in part be accomplished through outside organizations acting as contractors, in somewhat the same way as the reading and mathematics contractors described earlier. Community organizations could design specific cultural enrichment programs or community action programs involving students from several schools of different racial or class composition, with students engaging in such programs by their own or parent's choice. Thus, resources that exist outside the school could come to play an increasing part in education, through contracts with the schools. Some such programs might be community improvement activities, in which white and Negro high school students learn simultaneously to work together and to aid the community. But the essential element in such programs is that they should not be carried out by the school, in which case they would quickly die after the first enthusiasm had gone, but be undertaken by outside groups under contract to the school, and with the free choice of parent or child.

The idea of opening up the school, of conceiving of the home school as a center of operations, while it can aid the two goals of performance and integration described above, is much more than an ad hoc device for accomplishing these goals. It allows the parent what he has never had within the public school system: a freedom of choice as a consumer, as well as the opportunity to help establish special purpose programs, clinics and centers which can aid his child's education. It allows educational innovations the opportunity to prove themselves, insofar as they can attract and hold students. The contract centers provide the school with a source of innovation as well as a source of competition to measure its own efforts, neither of which it has had in the past. The interschool scheduling and interscholastic academic events widen horizons of both teachers and children, and provide a means of diffusing both the techniques and content of education, a means which is not possible so long as a school is a closed institution.

A still further problem that has always confronted public education, and has become intense in New York recently, is the issue of parental control versus control by the educational bureaucracy. This issue is ordinarily seen as one of legitimacy: how far is it legitimate for parents to exert organized influence over school policies? But the issue need not be seen this way. The public educational system is a monopoly, and such issues of control always arise in monopolies, where consumers lack a free choice. As consumers, they have a legitimate interest in what that monopoly offers them, and can only exercise this interest through organized power. But such issues do not arise where the consumer can implement his interest through the exercise of free choice between competing offerings. Until now, this exercise of choice has only been available for those who could afford to buy education outside the public schools.

It is especially appropriate and necessary that such an opening up of schools, providing consumer choice and placing the school in the role of agent to aid that choice, occur in a period when the interest of all society has become focused on the schools. The time is past when society as a whole, parents as individuals, and interested groups outside the school were willing to leave the task of education wholly to the public education system to watch children vanish into the school in the morning and emerge from it in the afternoon, without being able to affect what does on behind the school doors.

EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Willard J. Congreve
Director, Urban Education Development Project
Graduate School of Education
University of Chicago

I, too, wish to thank the planners of this conference for inviting me to talk about some ideas which we are developing in the context of the Woodlawn community in Chicago. When I was invited to participate I was optimistic enough to think that our planning would be completed by now and that I could report officially on the strategies we employed and the results of our efforts. But such is not the case. We have extended our contract with the Office of Education for another month, in the hope that December 31st will find the first developmental stage of our project completed.

We have maintained a pretty tight news blackout on our work in Chicago. We have done so because in a developmental project such as ours, we find ourselves constantly shifting positions as we try to arrive at rational and feasible answers to complex questions. Under such circumstances, news reports could be inaccurate and confusing. They might leave the impression that a course of action had been decided upon when actually, at the moment the reported tuned in on us, we were just testing out another alternative.

As I stand before you today I am bound to maintain this less-than-final, less-than-official stance. However, I believe I can fulfill my assignment as a member of the workshop faculty by discussing the strategies we have been using; identifying some of the problems we have encountered; and reporting to you the progress we are making as a result of our work. Our final conclusions and recommendations cannot be revealed until we have reported to the Office of Education and until preliminary action has been taken on our recommendations by the three institutions concerned.

The Urban Education Developmental Project is a feasibility study to determine if there are specific ways whereby a big city school system — the Chicago Public Schools, a prominent university — the University of Chicago, and a local community and its community organization — Woodlawn and The Woodlawn Organization, can collaborate to improve educational opportunity and achievement in the public schools of the community. Such collaboration, we feel, should be so designed to result in education of high quality in the schools, and to provide knowledge about both the processes of collaboration as well as the processes of changing the educational program which can be used to help other schools in other communities achieve better results. It is important that I make it clear that we are carrying out a feasibility study; we are not operating a school program at this time. We expect to propose some strong conclusions and recommendations which will support and validate collaborative efforts among three such groups. We also expect to come up with a program of action within a collaborative framework which has promise of bringing about the improvements which everyone so earnestly desires.

The Woodlawn community is located directly south of the University of Chicago campus. Its residents are almost entirely Negro. Many buildings are dilapidated and overcrowded and are classified as slum dwellings, but some blocks in the community contain privately owned two-story homes. The community is more heterogeneous than often supposed. Some of the schools have a lower middle class student body, but the majority of schools serve children whose parents meet the poverty criteria by a wide margin.

In the late 1950's, the two strongest church groups in the community, Presbyterian and Catholic, convinced their Chicago central agencies to spend $100,000 to hire Mr. Saul D. Alinsky and the Industrial Areas Foundation to organize the community. As a result The Temporary Woodlawn Organization was founded. It later became The Woodlawn Organization or T.W.O. During the early days of TWO both the University of Chicago and the public schools located in the community were targets for criticism and demands by this organization. Often the criticism had validity and the demands were reasonable. As time has passed, all three groups — T.W.O., the schools, and the University — have, through many discussions and deliberations, come to the realization that the welfare of the children in Woodlawn, the welfare of Woodlawn as a community, the welfare of the schools, the University, and the city itself lies no longer in animosity and strife among these institutions, but rather in finding ways in which the resources of all can be brought to bear upon meeting the intent and needs of all.

These three institutions were about at the brink of some form of collaboration when the Urban Education Developmental Project was launched. In one sense, the commitment on the part of all three institutions to engage in this feasibility study was an early instance of joint cooperation. Prior to this time the University had attempted to obtain federal funds to create an Urban Education Laboratory which did not involve the other two institutions. This proposal was unsuccessful but it did bring into sharp relief the need for participation of T.W.O. and the public schools in projects designed to improve educational practice.

Thus, I come to the first element in the strategy for collaboration. In preparing the proposal for this feasibility study, we recognized the urgent need for a group of persons, representing all three institutions, which could review ideas, make recommendations, and insure a sustained dialogue about the educational problems existing in the community. This awareness resulted in the creation of the Woodlawn Community Board. This is a tripartite board of 21 persons, seven each from the Chicago Public Schools, The Woodlawn Organization and the

University of Chicago. The Board is so structured that decisions on issues can be reached either through open voting by the delegates present or through caucus in which each delegation arrives at a position and then casts one vote. During the course of this feasibility study, the program plans developed by the staff have been brought to this board for review, discussion, and approval. As a result, the project plans include many ideas, or modifications of ideas contributed by board members.

While the Woodlawn Community Board has worked well for some functions, it has not solved all communications and involvement problems. Board meetings held once a month, and more often when the need for action was great, have not been sufficient to get all ideas aired. Several people on the Board really felt they were not participating in the project. Therefore, special discussion meetings were held with each delegation. These meetings were especially important for those delegations from the schools and the community which needed to have the assurance that their ideas and concerns were being given full consideration. These meetings were conducted as frequently as requested. In retrospect, we feel they were not as numerous as they might have been.

Another problem, which the existence of the Woodlawn Community Board did not seem to solve, was the difficulty of getting information back to the constituents of the institutions of each delegation. Although no matter discussed at a board meeting was ever declared confidential with respect to the personnel of an institution, there was usually a large gap between the persons sitting on the board and the other persons of the institution which they purportedly represented. For example, we could never be assured that the schools committee of T.W.O. would receive a full report of what happened at a Board meeting. The same was true for teachers in the schools and professors and administrative officers in the University. To counteract this difficulty, the staff of the project set up an advisory committee to the project in the University which included some persons different from those sitting on the Woodlawn Community Board. This helped to broaden contacts in the University. The principals of the East Woodlawn schools were urged to discuss board meetings with their teachers. The T.W.O. contingent was encouraged to hold discussions with its schools committee and report their interests and concerns back to the staff. In addition, the staff of the project met as often as possible with executive officers of the three institutions to keep them informed and to receive their criticisms and suggestions.

One additional technique for establishing and maintaining collaboration was to name a three-man core staff, one from each of the participating institutions. Because the grant came to the University of Chicago, I served as Director Associate Directors were appointed from T.W.O. and the Chicago Public Schools. This staff was supported by secretarial and graduate assistants from the University. The three man core staff aided in communications and provided visible evidence that all three institutions were represented during the course of the study.

In sum, I think it is accurate to report that the creation of a tripartite board and the establishment of a triumvirate staff served well to provide an initial base to test this three-way collaboration. At no time during the feasibility study did we ever lose sight of one of the three participating institutions. All recommendations rose out of deliberations in which representatives of all three institutions participated. Furthermore, as we now move into the proposal writing and the operational stage, we feel confident that this strong united tripartite board will be extremely helpful in getting experimental programs initiated in the Woodlawn schools. We will need strong support to obtain funds; and we will need the critical but supportive views of people from all institutions in keeping the programs directed toward the children and insuring that all persons will be involved who ought to be involved.

In addition to the strategies of involvement which I have just described, three other strategies were employed which I should like to report briefly to you: (1) the strategy of local problem identification; (2) the strategy of discrete pilot projects; and (3) the strategy of broad involvement in program planning.

It was no secret to anyone prior to this study that many of the Woodlawn schools are beset with difficult problems. They are, in many respects, like other schools in segregated Negro inner-city communities. We knew, before we got underway, that many such schools had been surveyed or otherwise studied and that there were volumes of material describing the conditions one could expect to find in these schools. Nevertheless, we also knew that Whitehead's assertion that every school is unique and should be considered somewhat special and different was valid and should guide us in our actions regarding the schools in East Woodlawn. Therefore, as a first step in our project, we conducted an assessment of conditions in the schools. Selected administrators, teachers, other school personnel, parents and children were invited to identify problems and suggest ways in which these problems might be attacked.

While it is true that our findings were not especially unique, they did point out major weaknesses in the social system of the schools. They also helped to garner support from school people who might otherwise have been unsympathetic with our conjectures if we had simply used the findings from the literature. Principals who reported problems of administrative practice now seem ready to accept the existence of such problems and to consider programs which might correct them. Teachers who reported tuned-out children are now ready to consider suggestions for new teaching techniques and different curricula which might tune in more of their pupils. Parents who reported difficulties in communicating with the school are now ready to consider suggestions for programs in which parents and teachers would work more closely together. When the staff finally suggested a plan designed to create a new social system involving both the school and the community which would focus on mutual helping relationships, full support was received from all three institutions.

The second strategy of discrete pilot projects during the feasibility study was helpful in developing confidence among the three institutions as well as in providing evidence that collaboration was indeed possible. Three such projects were launched. Two were successful. The third could not be considered a failure but it did not bring about change.

The first pilot project was a test conducted by a team of young film makers to determine if they could make a film which documented school and classroom activity without distorting the activity in progress and without requiring the use of stilted dialogue. For six weeks three cameramen and artistic technicians inhabited a school, taking still pictures, recording voices and testing the use of cameras. Their results were highly positive and have led to the submission of a major proposal which will make possible the shooting of such a film in a Woodlawn school.

The second pilot project was the establishment of an experimental substitute pool at the local community level. As we all know, substitute teachers are extremely hard to obtain in inner-city communities. It was our conviction that a local effort could find qualified people, who, if given a little personal treatment and proper orientation, would be willing to serve as substitutes exclusively in this community. We hired an indigenous person to do much of the recruiting, advertised in a few local papers and wrote letters to University families. In two weeks some thirty persons have been found, and more are showing up each day. In addition, we are finding some ways to make the processing of applications easier and to help these people feel they are really wanted.

Our third effort was to meet with teachers of two schools to examine the use of Title I funds. While our meetings were pleasant and seemingly productive in dialogue, they did not last long enough nor were they frequent enough to bring about any action different from the existing practices. However, looking at all three activities, it is possible to see that these provided significant pragmatic tests of collaboration.

The third strategy, that of broad involvement in program planning, was of particular importance. Even though the staff of the project was representative of the three institutions and did much of the initial work in the development of ideas, opportunities were extended to as many persons as each institution desired to have involved in the development of the specific plans and proposals for the operational phase of the experiment. Two major plans were developed and considered by no less than 75 persons. The first involved the creation of an administrative structure whereby experimental intervention could take place and tripartite collaboration could be maintained. Several alternative plans were developed and discussed by these many people. A final decision has not been made yet as to which plan will be adopted. Therefore, I cannot report to you on it. Suffice to say that the alternatives included plans whereby control of the schools would be in the hands of the local community, in the hands of the University, in the hands of the central administration control, and, in the hands of some tripartite arrangement.

The second plan had to do with the actual nature of the experimental interventions. Again, because final action has not been taken, I cannot reveal these plans. But I can report that because of the broad involvement of people, these plans represent the best thinking of curriculum experts in the university, practical educators in the field, and parents and children in the community. We are confident that if we can get this program accepted and funded, we will be able to put to a real test the conclusion of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights that education of high quality cannot be created in a segregated community. While all of us believe in integration, including the leadership of T.W.O. — The Reverend Arthur W. Brazier witnessed to this fact at the annual T.W.O. banquet on November 18, we do not believe integration is going to come to the Woodlawn schools in the next several years. Therefore, we must act now to find ways to provide the children of Woodlawn education of high quality in the schools they now attend.

I should like to close with a few informal observations. I am convinced that collaboration can take place among people and institutions which heretofore have felt impelled to "go it alone." Furthermore, I am convinced that unless such collaboration is created, we will not find the way out of the dilemma we are now in. Collaboration does not come easily. However, the difficulties do not exist because there are some good guys and some bad guys; the situation is not one where some saints are rising up to drive the sinners into line.

The difficulty we face is largely one of our background and experience. None of us have learned much about collaboration We have been educated in our schools and by our parents to compete, not to collaborate. Furthermore, our lives are still beset with competition, not collaboration. We compete for federal grants, we compete for jobs, we compete for college admission, we compete for scholarships, we even have to compete for a place in which to be buried. Collaboration does not rule out competition, but it requires that it be viewed in a different light. In collaboration we don't try to beat out the other guy. Rather we try to bring out the best in every man so he can help the other man to bring out the best in himself. When we collaborate, we seek to raise the level of every man. We don't try to step on men.

When we talk about collaboration, people get scared. They feel that collaboration will require them to give up their special interests or sacrifice their special abilities. This fear is usually unfounded. In collaboration what we seek is simply to make each man's special interest and ability go further in our society by joining it up with another man's special interest or ability. We do not seek to stop the schools from educating children and ask them to take over home and community functions. Nor do we seek to have the University step in and provide teachers and administrators from its staff to operate the schools. Through collaboration, we hope to find ways to bring the home curriculum and the school curriculum into some better accord; we seek to get the research, evaluation and training functions of universities in tune with what needs to go on in the home and school, so the scholar can help the school and the parents identify and solve their problems and at the same time contribute to the growing body of knowledge. Collaboration does not mean being all things to all people, although I sometimes think it requires an administrative coordinator who needs to try to do this. It does mean setting priorities and examining critically one's personal positions and prejudices. It does mean making hard choices, and it does mean some reallocation of resources. However, I am convinced that with men of good will, committed to findings ways to help our children, collaborative efforts, involving school, community and university people, can bring about the renaissance we are looking for. Thank you for your attention.

A WOULD-BE GUIDE TO URBAN EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS FOR MAYORS

Dr. Robert A. Dentler
Director, Center for Urban Education
New York City

The sixty professional educators, sociologists, psychologists, planners and related specialists on the full-time staff of the Center for Urban Education have had a great opportunity during the last three years, thanks to continuing fiscal support from the United States Office of Education. We have been paid to study, think about, and invent solutions to the problems confronting urban educational systems from a position of comparative calm and institutional independence. Our staff has been drawn from university faculty, city school officers and teachers, community service agencies, and from market and consumer research firms in business and industry. While we are young and lack continuity of experience, we are highly focused upon the pursuit of solutions through research and development in ways that were impossible prior to this decade.

We have published a steady stream of research reports, policy studies, evaluations, and interpretations. For a full grasp of what we have learned we commend these to all interested city administrators and elective officers. But this is the first occasion on which we have been asked to distill something of what we have learned and to apply it sympathetically to the situation of the city decision-maker and administrator.

Decision-makers located outside the educational community are often called upon to make choices about the funding of capital projects and expenditures for educational equipment. A valiant, generally successful attempt has been made by schoolmen since at least 1946 to argue that plant renewal and improvements in equipment were essential to progress in urban education.

Obviously, minimum standards must be set. I know of one Congressional district in a midwestern city, for example, where teachers cannot use audio-visual aids or other electrical technology because none of the public schools in that district are wired to carry the requisite electrical load. In the same district, none of the school plants even meet the city's standard code for facilities. In Pittsburgh, the average city high school is more than 55 years old and the newest one was constructed in 1927.

Contrary to the stereotypes conveyed in such films as "Blackboard Jungle" and "Up The Down Staircase", however, New York City has invested hundreds of millions of dollars in its school plant and equipment from 1948 to 1967. The pattern remains spotty; nevertheless, in and around each of the seven Negro and Puerto Rican ghettoes of that city, the city has constructed hundreds of new schools — some of them architectural prizewinners, most of them comparable to the best plants operating in the suburbs.

New York City's experience verifies what Coleman and Campbell found nationally: that plant and equipment are not correlated with the quality of teaching and learning. Stated in terms of political responsibility, capital projects in urban education are unwarranted. Similarly, heavy investments in instructional equipment, whether A/V aids or Edison Responsive Environment machines, are unwarranted.

The plant must be renewed and equipment updated, of course. But mayors, managers and councilmen who are called upon to approve capital expenditures should ask much tougher questions about how these expenditures will improve teaching and learning.

These conditions include the vital ingredient of public confidence in public educational services. In this respect, evidence of citizen participation in site selection, physical and social planning, and even in staffing of new or renovated plants should be part of judging the educational feasibility of capital projects.

The educational services of a modern American city encompass everything from infant day care to obligatory programs of instruction toward literacy and employability for welfare recipients. So vast is the myth about the power of education to transform social problems into opportunities, and so proliferative are educational projects, the urban policy-maker is apt to stagger under the burden of fixing priorities. A million voices may be heard urging instant academies for police and firemen, pre-school programs, community colleges and skills centers for the young adult poor, consumer education for housewives, and continuing education for all.

At the Center we believe that greatest priority should be given to educational services to children between the ages of four and ten. Let me illustrate this in two ways.

In 1966, there were roughly 20,000 Negro 18 year olds in New York. All but about 5,000 resided in New York City. Our estimate for current college admissions is 5 percent; thus about 1,000 of these youths will enter college in 1967. However, only about 600 Negro twelfth graders in the city were eligible for admission to the senior colleges of The City University in the spring of 1966, according to one reliable source. About twice that number, or about 1,200, were eligible to enter some college.

One field study conducted at the Center in 1966 used the records of 155 Negro youths who were Harlem ninth grade graduates in 1963. All were born, raised, and educated within New York City. Of the 155, 41, or about 27 percent, received high school diplomas in 1966. But of these, only ten, or 6 percent, were academic diplomas. Of the 155, 51, or 32 percent, dropped out entirely between 1963 and 1966.

Cumulative school failure thus begins for Negro and Puerto Rican students in New York City at the third grade and climaxes in the tenth grade. The Coleman-Campbell report demonstrates that this curve of failure is sharpest for Puerto Rican students. The curve is institutionalized. It does not result from differential distributions of basic intelligence.

Second, the initial gap in learning ability between the urban minority poor and the urban majority advantaged is an insubstantial gap. There is a gap, due to differences in pre- as well as post-natal environmental conditions. But the notion that the one group arrives at school burdened with cognitive deficiencies while the other is unburdened is false. What is true is that this initial small gap widens terribly if little or nothing is done about it in the early grades.

Special interest group concern with vocational education, with academic high schools, and with college opportunities aside, then, the mayor should recognize that strategic concern rests with the quality of early childhood services. By contrast, everything else involving the application of education as a remedy for social disorganization of the city is strictly that — remedial, reparative, patchy, and expensive.

It seemed evident a few years ago that what was needed was a massive improvement in elementary level services, together with new programs for pre-school children. Most of us at the Center still believe this is correct, but we have discovered that city systems cannot produce the massive changes that are needed, nor can they introduce a stable and yet flexible pre-school program.

We have completed more than 40 evaluations of compensatory educational projects carried on within New York City since 1965. And, we have studied reports from other cities and conducted some elsewhere ourselves. The evidence is uniformly discouraging yet indicative of what needs to be done. It is discouraging because it is now plain that combinations of extra money, extra staff, new curricular materials, new instructional equipment, new special services, trips, exchanges, and remedial efforts, fail to modify the curve of cumulative failure in early reading and arithmetic.

The best conceived, best funded, and best administered compensatory program we have examined, invented by the United Federation of Teachers and called the More Effective Schools Program, is illustrative: School life was happier, teachers and pupils had higher morale, and parents were better satisfied with school services, as a result of MES. At a cost of two to two and one half times the standard expenditure rate, MES showed early, impressive results — except on academic performance.

Neither MES nor any other federally aided compensatory program has thus far gotten to the core of the challenge; namely, the core of modifying the relation between teacher and pupil. This core is not apt to be reached, what is more, until there are changes in basic state and city educational policies affecting teacher education, certification, recruitment, the determination of assignments, salaries and raises, promotions and, most of all, tenure. When these policies are changed in directions befitting the needs and interests of students as public clients, school officers will be in a position to take what Coleman in his paper has called "responsibility for the child's learning." We are perfectly aware that such changes might entail vast power struggles between interest groups, entrenched or dispossessed! But at least this much may be asked by the mayor when he is asked to endorse school budgets: what relevant administrative revisions and teaching reforms will take place concurrent with increased expenditures?

I do not share Coleman's enthusiasm for a contractually decentralized educational system in our cities. I share his premise about the critical value of "opening up the school" on behalf of increasing "free choice for the consumer," but I am not at all sanguine about the vision of creatively productive "contractors" that he advances. If the contractors are to spring from the education industry, from schools of education, or from the ranks of private school operatives, then I am not only not sanguine, I am depressed. If the source is the leadership within the anti-poverty agencies at the local urban level, I am prospectively despondent. If it is a mixture of all of these, I must confess to a vision of chaos.

If big city systems are planfully decentralized, however, they can be made responsive to the forces of democratic pluralism. If local control were increased planfully, the accountability of school officers and teachers could be made visible and thereby pertinent to a standard of pupil-centered responsibility.

Most decentralization proposals are deficient in at least three respects. First, the proposals avoid any tampering with bedrock issues of apprenticeship, certification, assignment, promotion, and tenure. This is true of the Bundy Report, except for its provision for "incentive grants" intended to reward innovations. As such, decentralization of sublocalities may be accomplished, without consequences for improving teaching and learning.

Second, some proposals are impelled by the fantasy of a fresh start. They imply that one can disown existing plants, personnel, and statutory regulations. At the Center we suspect that this disguises a vast power surgency concerned more with securing political control over educational resources than with the aim of improving services to children. At best, for instance, the contract scheme would have to be applied neighborhood by neighborhood, experimentally and gradually, until a cadre of talented contractors were created. At worst, it would involve a power sweep and would result in a vacuum of professional competency.

Third, the number of instances in which plans for decentralization have been closely articulated with plans for improved health, welfare and housing services is still too close to zero to deserve consideration. If schools are to be opened up to the public, if they are to become fluid, flexible community services, their functions will first have to be related to other municipal functions. The gap between boards of education and city halls will have to be closed, and this will occur only upon the initiative of the mayors.

My comments have included the following guidelines: (1) Before endorsing great expenditures on capital projects, mayors should ask hard questions about citizen participation in project planning and about concurrent efforts to improve teaching and school administration; (2) The eye of the mayoral eagle should be fixed upon improvements in early childhood education as the pivotal and strategic objective; (3) Compensatory educational programs are warranted to the extent that they include changes in teaching practices. These can occur only with changes in policies controlling educational personnel — assignment, promotion, and tenure in particular; (4) Decentralization proposals are promising devices for increasing the responsiveness of schools to local needs and interests. These proposals should be assessed closely by mayors on three counts, however: the extent to which they get at changes in the behavior of teachers; the degree to which they offer some economy of continuity in the use of school plants and personnel; and the quality with which the proposals are integrated with health, welfare and housing plans of corresponding agencies.

THE CRISIS IN URBAN EDUCATION: A VIEW FROM THE HILL

The Honorable John Brademas
U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Education and Labor

The introduction to a book published in this country over 75 years ago read: "...What shall we do with our great cities? What will our great cities do with us? These are the problems that concern every thoughtful American.

"For the question involved in these two questions does not concern the city alone. The whole country is affected, if indeed its character and history are not determined by the condition of its great cities..."

If it is true that the character and history of the whole country are determined by the condition of our cities — as I believe it is — then the outlook for America may not be altogether bright.

For we have been rediscovering the American city in the last few years and for many of us, the experience has not been a happy one.

For many Americans, the city is the symbol of light and learning, of art and music, of ticker tape parades and foreign restaurants, of complexity and fascination.

But for many other Americans, the city is a jungle — of racial strife, slum housing, third-rate schools, of hopelessness and despair.

Our task, I believe — yours as mayors, municipal officials, school board members and school administrators — and mine as a Congressman concerned with these matters, is to work to revitalize our cities and thereby our country, to make them the centers and generators of the best, not the worst, in American life.

And in my view, the role of education — your schools and universities — in that process of revitalization is crucial.

So I am glad to be with you today and to have the opportunity to discuss with you the crisis in our urban schools from the perspective of a member of the Committee of the House of Representatives — the Education and Labor Committee — with chief responsibility for writing education legislation.

I want here to salute both the U.S. Office of Education and the National League of Cities on having organized this Model Cities Workshop. In doing so, you have recognized the importance of bringing together both city and school officials.

For city halls and school boards must get better acquainted with each other, or a major purpose of the Model Cities program will be completely frustrated and the task of radically improving city schools severely hampered.

I shall not here trace the pathogenesis of city problems. You better than I know the painful need for more money, better trained personnel, additional facilities.

I want rather to talk to you about the problems of education in our cities as viewed by one Member of Congress, to touch on some of the issues in the relationship between the schools and the cities, and to comment on the role of Congress in respect of this relationship.

It has been only within the past several years that Congress has shown signs of recognizing the seriousness of the urban crisis. Since 1964 Congress has authorized a number of programs aimed at providing at least some measure of relief for our beleaguered cities. They include, for instance, such landmark legislation as the Model Cities Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Teacher Corps, rent supplements, Title I of the High Education Act, several key civil rights acts, amendments to the Housing Act, the Economic Opportunity Act and, more recently, legislation to help meet the problems of air, water and solid waste pollution.

I would not for a moment suggest that the appropriations for any of these programs has been adequate to meet the need. On the contrary, in some cases — for example, rent supplements and the Teacher Corps — Congressional appropriations have been so low as to be almost shameful. No matter how promising the legislation, its impact, if starved for appropriations, will be greatly lessened.

This afternoon I want to discuss several broad problem areas that bear directly on the future of urban education, more precisely, on elementary and secondary education in the inner cities of America.

My list is certainly not intended to be all-inclusive. Another caveat: most of these public policy questions are interrelated and to some degree overlapping. Nevertheless, for present purposes they can be viewed as distinguishable problems.

The first policy area affecting urban education is the perplexing and highly charged issue of the relationship between racial imbalance and quality of education. The question is: does school integration or do compensatory education programs constitute the most effective approach to achieving equal opportunity in education?

You have had the opportunity this morning to listen to no less an authority than

Dr. James S. Coleman, so I shall not venture deeply into this question.

As you know, there are educators and civil rights leaders on both sides of this issue, and the end of the controversy is not in sight. At the U.S. Civil Rights Commission conference on "Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities" two weeks ago, integration versus compensation became the major topic of debate, and both points of view were effectively presented. Indeed, the contending positions on each side are backed by formidable statistics and impressive expertise. I would suggest, however, that spokesmen for the two sides may be withdrawing into hardened positions and closing out middle ground alternatives.

Bayard Rustin, in his address at that conference, made a plea for reason when he said, "We have got to stop the debate over whether you're for integration or quality. You're for quality first, and for that degree of integration which is consistent with it. We want children who can read, write, and do arithmetic."

I don't think it is yet proved with any certainty what degree of integration is in fact required to achieve quality education, nor do we know, in the absence of integration, how much quality can be achieved by means of compensatory programs such as Title I of ESEA. We simply do not have the hard data to show one way or another, with irrefutable evidence, the extent to which substantial compensatory programs can make real differences on a nation-wide scale in the quality of schooling for disadvantaged children.

Whatever proves to be the best approach to assure quality education, we must recognize that de facto segregation is not going to disappear of its own accord. Across the country, almost 80 percent of white first-graders attend schools that are from 90 to 100 percent white. The sad corollary is that more than 65 percent of our Negro first grade pupils are isolated in schools which are at least 90 percent Negro.

Moreover, in many of our largest cities including a number which you represent today, the degree of classroom segregation is actually on the rise.

Or consider another facet of the problem, the cumulative effects of deprivation. The report prepared by Dr. Coleman for the Office of Education showed that Negroes in the sixth grade of metropolitan cities of the Northeast lag 1.6 years in academic achievement behind whites from the same areas. By grade 9, the gap widens to 2.4 years, and at grade 12, the Negro student is fully 3.3 years behind his white counterpart. None of us, I think, would be tempted to call that equal education. I am sure that Dr. Coleman would be the first to agree that his study has been used by many people to prove many different cases. However, I consider one of his findings extremely significant: "...if a minority pupil from a home without much educational strength is put with schoolmates with strong educational backgrounds, his achievement is likely to increase."

In the light of this evidence, will Congress act to help overcome persisting racial imbalance? Frankly, there is little sympathy in Congress — at least this present Congress — to venture into this thorniest of political thickets.

We need only look at one often-proposed approach to the problem, busing. As evidenced by the express prohibition found in Title IV of the Civil Rights Act, there is a strong feeling in Congress against busing children for the specific purpose of overcoming racial imbalance. Furthermore, the sanctity of the neighborhood school is still such that even transportation of students incidental to an educational program is suspect to many of my colleagues.

So right now major attempts to overcome the debilitating effects of racial imbalance based on neighborhood residential patterns will have to be undertaken by local officials without much Federal assistance. Only indirectly, perhaps through legislation authorizing Federal funds for educational parks or other metropolitan educational centers, is Congress likely to assume much responsibility for eliminating de facto segregation. Having laid aside the stick, whether Congress will choose to dangle the carrot remains to be seen.

The next problem is as simple to state as it is difficult to find: money. During the current school year, an estimated $32 billion will be spent on public elementary and secondary education. Although the Federal contribution is enormous compared to Federal help merely five years ago, still only 8.1 percent of the support for elementary and secondary education comes from Federal sources. The lion's share, 54.1 percent of the total, comes from local funds, and 37.8 percent from State funds.

Meanwhile, urban school buildings decay, city teachers are grossly underpaid and per pupil expenditures in inner city schools, while on the rise, are at present woefully inadequate.

Despite the urgent need for more school funds, revamping local tax and other revenue sources is obviously not a job for Congress.

Congress could, of course, embark on a policy of general aid to education. Indeed, some important conditions are more amenable to such legislation now than they were during, say, the Kennedy Presidency. For example, both school authorities and the public are less fearful that federal dollars mean federal control. For another, State departments of education, partly through resources provided by Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, appear to be making some progress. Perhaps when Congress feels that state education departments become responsive to big city school needs, Congress will be more likely to adopt a block grant or general aid approach.

Meanwhile, I see no groundswell of support for a general aid effort, either among members of the Education and Labor Committee or among my colleagues not serving on the Committee.

On a balance, then, it is not likely that Federal funds will be available for elementary and secondary schools in greatly increased amounts in the near future especially as long as Viet Nam persists.

Congress can, however, ease the burden on local school districts through providing Federal assistance, on a categorical basis, for identified educational problem areas. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, through the operation of its formula based on grants to school districts with concentrations of children from low-income families, attempts to do just that. Title III, authorizing innovative and supplementary centers, offers another means for local educators to utilize Federal funds in solving some of their knottiest problems.

Yet Federal assistance will remain supplementary to State and local efforts and therefore much of your success in the cities will depend on a reshaping of antiquated and insufficient State and local sources of revenue for public education.

Let us now consider a third perplexing problem, providing teachers for inner city schools.

Our urban areas need more teachers, better trained teachers, and teachers specially equipped to deal with the problems of the ghetto. More than 5 percent of the teaching force in our schools — approximately 90,500 full-time teachers — do not meet the certification standards of their states. On opening day last year, New York City had to mobilize a 500-man substitute teacher force for full-time duty.

America's urban ghettos suffer the worst teacher shortages; the teachers there are often the most poorly-trained in the school system. Part of the blame must fall on seniority arrangements which permit veteran teachers to choose the schools in which they will serve. This local policy almost invariably has the effect of transferring the most experienced teachers away from those schools and those students that most desperately need them.

And a survey conducted early this year for Grade Teacher magazine underscores this shameful weakness in our schools of not winning enough good teachers to the slums. Only 13 percent of today's graduating teachers said they would definitely accept a position in a slum school.

In the main, teacher-training curricula are based on the assumption that graduates will teach in white, middle-class suburban schools. Teacher education in America does not give nearly enough attention to the special requirements of the center-city child, the child whose readiness for education is impaired by family background. Just as the university curriculum fails adequately to equip the prospective ghetto teacher, so will that teacher in turn fail the children he hopes to teach.

Congress is attempting to help here some. We have recognized that a dialogue between urban schools and teacher-training institutions is essential if our teachers are to be adequately prepared for the challenges of urban education. Two years ago, Congress established the Teacher Corps in an attempt to stimulate such a dialogue. The Teacher Corps legislation recognizes that teaching in low-income areas requires special training, special skills, and special dedication.

The Teacher Corps has had a stormy life in Congress, and it is no credit to us that Congress allowed it only $13.5 million for the current year, a savage slash from the Administration's original request of $36 million. As President Johnson said, "The Teacher Corps has been put on a starvation diet."

Ironically, I have heard almost no criticism emanating from the schools to which Corpsmen were bringing new ideas and new enthusiasm. On the contrary, teachers and administrators of these schools, including two junior high schools in my own home town of South Bend, Indiana have been highly vocal in their support for the program.

I should here note that Congress last summer passed the Education Professions Development Act, which draws together programs with great potential importance in the field of teacher training. The new law extends and modifies the experienced and prospective teacher fellowship programs originally contained in the Higher Education Act, and adds new programs for the training of other educational personnel at all levels. In addition, the Act establishes a new program of grants to States to enable them to support local efforts to attract qualified teachers into shortage areas.

Another way in which Congress could act here is to provide significant sums of money to supplement teachers' salaries either directly, that is, by means of a salary bill or less directly, through general aid. Neither approach, however, is likely to be forthcoming in the near future.

Let me here mention one other measure. In 1966 Congress amended the Economic Opportunity Act to authorize programs aimed at training ghetto residents for what have been termed "subprofessional" jobs in fields such as education, health services and law enforcement. These amendments, sponsored by my very able colleague, Congressman James Scheuer of New York, embody the "New Careers" concept that for several years has been advocated by various social scientists. The aim is to create new job opportunities for the poor by separating out those aspects of professional jobs which are routine and can be performed with a minimum of training by inexperienced men and women in need of employment.

Although little money has yet been allocated to implement this innovative program, it is now being administered by the Department of Labor on a small scale. So far the program has demonstrated a great potential not only for providing the poor with jobs, but also for helping our schools in a number of ways: by involving parents in the operation of the schools and by relieving the professional teachers in the schools of their non-professional tasks, thereby permitting more individual attention for the children.

A fourth acute need confronting urban education, and, indeed, all education, is our need for more learning about learning.

Despite innumerable studies of the nature of the learning process, in the final analysis we know far too little about it — about motivation, cognition, the skills necessary for conceptualization — all highly elusive subjects. We still don't know, for instance, the answer to the superficially simple question of the best way to teach first graders how to read.

Research and dissemination activities, although the prime responsibility of universities and other institutions, have been a Congressional concern since the passage of the Cooperative Research Act in 1954. More recently, Congress has launched other promising programs, including clearinghouses in a variety of fields across the country by ERIC, the Educational Research Information Center of the Office of Education. Also supported by Federal funds are regional laboratories, such as the Center for Urban Education in New York City, which concentrate on the educational problems of a region, covering several counties or even including several States.

Yet despite this new intensity of Congressional interest in educational research, we invest far too little in basic or developmental research in education. Although our nation as a whole invests about 3 percent of its gross national product in research and development, we set aside no more than two-fifths of 1 percent of our national expenditures in education for R and D. This phenomenon can be stated another way: this country spends, proportionately, twenty times as much on health research and sixty times as much on defense research as we do on research in education.

What will Congress likely contribute here in the months ahead? I believe that more learning about the learning process will flow from several activities. First, we will probably see more Congressional insistence on closer evaluation in order to determine the effectiveness of Federal urban-oriented programs such as Headstart and Title I of ESEA.

Second, I believe that Congress will soon recognize that our support of research in education is inadequate both in absolute terms and as compared to federally-subsidized research in other areas.

The main burden, though, in uncovering the secrets of learning will continue to rest with our universities.

I pass now to a fifth point, that of revitalization of the urban environment. As this Model Cities Workshop demonstrates, the problems of urban education go far beyond teacher training or school facilities or racial composition. If our cities are to remain viable places to live and if the urban child is genuinely to be educated, large-scale remaking of our entire cities is essential. And this remaking on a comprehensive scale is, of course, what the Model Cities program is all about. This notion is far broader than the traditional concept of urban renewal which has acquired the unattractive reputation of ignoring human values.

The Coleman Report is very instructive at this point. It offers impressive evidence that student achievement is more closely linked to the child's home background than to such school characteristics as teachers' salaries, laboratories, libraries and classroom size. The fundamentally important variable thus emerging is the spectrum of educational and economic resources available to the student at home.

The implications here are plain. If we seriously intend to "do something" about urban education, we will have to provide the wherewithal to revitalize entirely the dismal ghettoes of urban America.

Only through a concerted, and expensive, across-the-board attack — on the problems of housing, health and employment as well as education — can we begin to provide an environment in which the city child has a chance to escape from the grim fate which otherwise awaits him.

In recent years, Congress has showed that it is aware of the multi-faceted nature of the urban crisis, and we have passed exciting and hopeful legislation, including the Model Cities Act and the Economic Opportunity Act. Yet, as I have already said, the amount of money Congress has appropriated for a racial, not to say, revolutionary, change in the urban development has been tragically little.

What lies ahead? If we take the present Congress as a bench mark, the outlook is gloomy for innovation legislation to help the cities in the next few years. Much obviously depends upon the cause of the Vietnam war, upon next year's Presidential and Congressional elections, and on the extent to which the American people prove willing to support programs that will make possible a genuine renaissance of the American city. The question is open, and if you invite me back a year from now to your next conference, I can give you a more authoritative answer.

Finally, I come to what is perhaps the most vital issue of all for a conference like yours so far as urban education is concerned. I speak of the critical importance of establishing workable linkages between the people who run our cities and the people who run our schools.

It seems clear to me that our city school systems should not seek shelter from the political leadership of the community but support. The distinguished President of Teachers College, Columbia University, John H. Fischer, made the same point here in Washington only last month in an address that should be required reading for all of us, "Urban Schools for an Open Society".

Said Dr. Fischer: "The tradition of separation that has so long dominated public school policy and administration has become anachronistic. The mechanisms initially designed to protect the schools from partisan or corrupt political influence, however necessary they once were, now tend to isolate the schools from other agencies and to insulate them from normal political processes."

Let me quote President Fischer still further, for what he says is, I think you will agree, directly relevant to the concept of the Model Cities program:

> "In the city, as in the nation, every important undertaking today has its educational aspect. Many projects have no future at all unless they can count on effective schools. An intricate network of relationships ties the families of every community to its economic cultural, political and social institutions. With virtually all of these agencies and many of the families, the school is connected in mutual dependence. Yet among school boards, administrators and university people, there are many who still think that these connections call for no more than routine courtesies, prudent "public relations," and a vigilant watch against any sign of encroachment on the school's traditional prerogatives."

These words are echoed in a similar plea which Commissioner of Education Harold Howe made to schoolmen last summer:

> "Educators must start paying attention to some matters we have neglected in the past: to tax policy, to site selection, to the multiple use of land and buildings. We should, now and then, forget about computer-assisted instruction and team-teaching and non-graded classes and dream a little bit, not about what kind of city school we want, but about what kind of city we want."

But if these sermons to educators are in order, you mayors and city councilmen require admonition, too. I must cite John Fischer, for more eloquently than any figure except Commissioner Howe, he has put his finger on the urgent requirements of dialogue and cooperation between the office of the mayor and the office of the school superintendent:

> "Urban planning that does not now include educational planning is not unrealistic it is irresponsible. Such planning must moreover go far beyond a perfunctory review by the planning body of the size and location of new school sites. It must confront questions of curriculum, attendance patterns, teacher supply, financial support; in brief, the whole complex interrelationship between the development of schools and the total development of

> the city. The need for such planning is crucial and so is the manner in which it is done. Not only the central planning agency, but the school authorities, other public and private agencies, and the municipal and state governments must accept jointly the responsibility for projecting goals and setting timetables, and they must also share the responsibility for seeing that commitments are met."

For isolation of city officials from school officials is far too often the pattern of urban education in America. Yet urban schools cannot possibly make the dramatic improvement they must have unless their progress is linked directly to the betterment of the cities.

A major approach of the Model Cities program of course is to involve all of the institutions of the city — public and private — government, business, education, labor and the social agencies — in planning and carrying out programs aimed at progress on every front — jobs, housing, health and education.

But without increasing dialogue and cooperation between mayors and school superintendents, between city councilmen and school principals, the battle to educate the urban child will never be won.

For example, the toughest dilemma facing our schools today is providing equal opportunity for minority children, and the schools are not likely to find the answer to this problem without the help of skillful and intelligent political leadership in the cities.

At the same time, urban schools are feeling increasing pressures, not only from racial minorities, but also from better organized teachers and better organized parent groups. I should think that, given these pressures, schoolmen would not flee but would embrace the help of elected political leaders and their appointees.

I here recall what another distinguished leader in American education, Commissioner Howe's predecessor, Francis Keppel, once said:

> "Education is too important to be left to the educators."

Mr. Keppel is right and that is why I urge more conversation and cooperation between school leaders and political leaders.

And that, too, is why I would paraphrase Mr. Keppel to say that our cities are too important to be left to city hall.

We require, if we are effectively to attack the many problems of the cities, the involvement of every sector of community life with every other sector. And this, to reiterate, is what the Model Cities program is all about.

Let me conclude. I started with the premise that the depth of our national crisis in urban education makes it absolutely imperative that we reassess, reorganize and radically expand our efforts to educate the children of urban America.

The only alternative to revolutionary improvement of our city schools is the continuing disaster of still another generation of children bred in the slums and ill-prepared to lead productive lives in our not-so-open society.

I have touched upon six policy areas which directly affect our capacity to achieve this desperately needed improvement in urban education — and I have given you an assessment of the extent to which Congress is likely to contribute to that regeneration. My predictions have not been especially hopeful, but I have tried to indicate some encouraging signs.

In the final analysis, of course, whether Congress acts to meet these needs will depend upon the mood of the country. And you, as leaders of cities and of school systems can help shape that mood — in two ways.

First, you can help persuade the citizens of your respective cities of the urgency of the urban school dilemma — and the importance of their supporting effective action in Congress to meet it.

Second, you can dramatize your own awareness of the depth of the crisis of our city schools by acting swiftly and actively to demonstrate that the political leaders of your cities and the leaders of your schools are working closely together.

You can, in short, show yourselves to be the model for the Model Cities Program.

POLITICAL QUESTIONS IN THE NEXT DECADE OF URBAN EDUCATION

George R. La Noue
Assistant Professor of Government and Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

In a sense my task is impossible. The sponsors of this workshop had hoped someone could provide a definitive statement of the ways in which city governments and school governments are related and the consequences of different patterns of relationship. We know that there are school systems that are fiscally dependent and fiscally independent, school systems with "weak" superintendents vis-a-vis the mayor or school board and "strong" superintendents, school systems with school boards that are elected on a partisan or non-partisan basis, at large or in wards, or appointed by mayors, judges or in effect by educational pressure groups, but political scientists are not at all certain about the consequences of all this.

The only serious published study thus far is now badly out-of-date. In 1938, professors from the Political Science and Education departments of the University of Chicago set out to describe the then-existing formal legal and administrative educational relationship in 33 cities. The study entitled, *Schools and City Government* by Nelson B. Henry and Jerome B. Kerwin, took five years to complete and most of the information was obsolete before it got into print.

Nothing so ambitious has been published since then. About the only things we have of recent vintage on large cities are a description of the relationship of the Chicago School Board to city politics in a book called *The School Board Crisis* by Joseph Pois, a professor, businessman and former member of the Chicago School Board; and an analysis of the consequences of the autonomy of school politics and city politics in New York in a monograph titled *Participants and Participation* by Marilyn Gittel, a professor at Queens College. In another context but on a similar subject, Roscoe Martin of Syracuse University has written a book, *Government and the Suburban Schools,* and Ralph Kimbrough of the University of Florida in his book *Politics and Educational Decision-Making* has described school politics in small southern towns.

But that is about it and as a political scientist, I am embarrassed to admit the reason for this paucity of research on the most important function of local government. As Thomas H. Eliot pointed out in his influential essay "Toward an Understanding of Public School Politics," political scientists have been taken in by the traditional myth that public schools and city politics are in fact and ought to be separate. Even a cursory glance reveals, however, that every aspect of public education including curriculum, districting, financing, facilities and personnel, is deeply involved in either a state or local political process and political scientists have finally caught on. The lack of research in this area, therefore, is neither endemic nor hopeless. The Danforth Foundation is currently financing a five-city comprehensive study of school administrative politics in Chicago, Atlanta, New York, Boston, and Los Angeles, and at Teachers College my colleague, Norm Adler, and I have prepared a twenty-city study on the consequences of different patterns of school board recruitment. Among other things, we want to know whether election or appointment or any combination of these devices make a consistent difference in the socio-economic characteristics, attitudes or behavior of board members. So although I cannot report to you the results of any comparative research on urban school politics, the two studies mentioned and the many others under way should begin to provide the data necessary to understand this area. I hope that we can engage in some further discussion about what kinds of research political scientists might do that would be of benefit to you who have to make policy decisions.

Since my discipline has not yet completed its homework, I am reduced to speculation about the future, as are all social scientists who are caught without facts. I would like, then, to describe some of the alternatives available to urban education in the next decade and indicate some of the political consequences of each. The cities about which I will generalize will be roughly those urban centers with over a million inhabitants, and although I am a midwesterner by birth and sentiment, I hope you will excuse me if I draw most of my analysis and examples from my eastern professional experience.

The first unavoidable question, I suppose, is whether public education will survive the next decade in the great cities. Public education is permanently established, it would seem, in the suburbs across the country and in almost all of the small and medium sized cities except where integration problems are most severe. But will a public school system, as we have known it, continue to predominate in the large eastern and northern cities?

Washington is the prime example of a public school system that may be beyond repair, as pointed out in the recently published 593-page study of the Washington system by Harry Passow of Teachers College. Neither expenditures which have been about average for large cities nor administrative devices, many of which turned out to be unconstitutional anyway according to Judge Wright's opinion in Hobson v. Hansen, designed to favor the remaining white middle class have succeeded. The white population has fled to the suburbs or enrolled their children in private or parochial schools so that the Washington public schools, which were 55 percent white before the Supreme Court's desegregation decision in 1954, are now only 10 percent white and the city itself has a Negro majority. With a 50 percent drop-out rate, educational achievement and staff morale are so bad that middle-class Negroes are now deserting the system or demanding class-segregated schools. Also, 50 percent of the children in the Washington public schools now come from families below the $3,000 poverty line.

Washington, of course, has not been a typical American city either in its population trends or in its relationship of government to schools. But last year, Negroes comprised 40 percent of the school population in half of the 36 largest American cities, and demographers tell us these trends toward a non-white population in central cities will continue. Furthermore, although no other school system has had to deal directly with a Congressional Committee for its appropriations and powers, there are other cities where the city administration has been as aloof and/or negative. In short, then, the question is not whether Washington has been typical in the past, but whether it is the prototype of the future. Can a public enterprise survive when it has lost the support of the white middle class, is losing support among middle class Negroes, and is viewed with deep distrust by lower classes of both races?

Some clues as to public education's future might be found in examining the collapse of another urban public enterprise — the public hospital. Two months ago, the magazine section of the New York Times featured an article titled "The City Should Get Out of the Hospital Business." The author, a private hospital administrator, argued that public control and quality medicine were inherently incompatible, and all municipal hospitals should be turned over to voluntary groups. This proposal has attracted considerable support, and private hospitals are already politically powerful enough in New York so that their representatives are able to battle the Lindsay administration for designation as the coordinator and recipient of federal funds. The predicament of the public hospitals seems to be characterized by three elements: (1) unresponsive and chaotic administration, (2) an operational policy focused on providing the cheapest medicine for the poorest people and a consequent inability to compete for a middle-class clientele and the best of staff and facilities, and (3) finally, federal financial policies in the form of construction grants such as the Hill-Burton Act, that aided private hospitals relatively more than public hospitals and the Medicare program which grants funds to individuals who then purchase private medicine. Will this pattern characterize public education in the next decade?

Not surprisingly, public education's dilemma has caused many to question traditional assumptions about financing and administering education, and suggestions for restructuring public school politics or even setting up alternatives to public education are made with increasing frequency. There seem to be at least six live options or models for urban education in the future. Discussing the most private alternatives first, they are:

(1) A tax-supported tuition or voucher system paid to individual parents who would then be able to purchase education from many competing private schools in the market place.

(2) A system of direct grants to private schools in publicly-determined categories.

Either the tuition grant or direct grant system can be conceived of as complementary or replacing the existing system of public support of public schools.

(3) Contracts issued by public agencies to corporations, universities and other groups who would manage "public" schools.

(4) Parent-managed schools that are public because they are supported entirely through tax funds and are open to all children in the neighborhood.

(5) Public schools managed by a school board composed of various publicly-appointed representatives of community groups.

(6) Public schools managed by a school board directly elected by the whole community.

The first three alternatives draw support from an unusual coalition of individuals as ideologically diverse as Professor Milton Friedman, Barry Goldwater's favorite economist, and Christopher Jencks, the education editor of the New Republic, and groups as different as the Chamber of Commerce, the Catholic Church, black power militants and White Citizens Councils. One common argument made, though for many different reasons, is the need to create competition in education and to destroy the "public school monopoly." Jencks stated frankly in an article in The Public Interest entitled "Is the Public School Obsolete?"

> Either tuition grants or management contracts to private organizations would, of course, "destroy the public school system as we know it." When one thinks of the remarkable past achievements of public education in America, this may seem a foolish step. But we must not allow the memory of past achievements to blind us to present failures. Nor should we allow the rhetoric of public school men to obscure the issue. It is natural for public servants to complain about private competition, just as private business complains about public competition. But if the terms of the competition are reasonable, there is every reason to suppose that it is healthy. Without it, both public and private enterprises have a way of ossifying. And if, as some fear, the public schools could not survive in open competition with private ones, then perhaps they should not survive.

Jencks and the others who have made this argument have, it seems to me, greatly oversimplified the need for and the effects of competition at the elementary and secondary level. In the first place, competition already exists. Except in the South, private schools enroll between 15 percent and 35 percent of all students in almost every large city. In addition, city public school systems compete against suburban public school systems and the public schools within the city compete for teachers, special projects, administrative status and in extracurricular activities. If decentralization takes place, competition will increase and students may have several different public choices.

Secondly, neither public schools nor private schools operate according to the classical free market pattern, so the assumption that public schools will automatically respond to private competition by becoming more responsive to their clientele and more efficient is quite doubtful. Neither public school nor private school managements are paid on the basis of their ability to expand their system's share of the student market. Indeed, the attractiveness of private education rests on its power to limit its student body on intellectual, socio-economic, religious or racial lines and no public school can legally compete in that way. Since private schools want only the "best" student, their ability to skim off the "cream" may cause public schools to suffer from too much rather than too little competition. When large numbers of the most middle-class ambitious parents enroll their children in private schools, it makes it impossible for public schools to integrate racially, to maintain opportunities for lower-class children to learn from their middle-class peers, which the Coleman report states is a key factor in achievement, or to find community support for educational reform. In other words, the existence of a readily-available private school alternative may create a vicious circle — the more white, middle-class students leave the public schools, the poorer the image and quality of the schools become — the poorer the schools become, the more middle-class non-whites and lower-class whites leave. In the end, public schools are left with a clientele composed almost entirely of lower-class non-whites, as has happened in Washington and also in the municipal hospital systems of several cities. Reform becomes impossible.

However, as long as the image and reality of urban public schools remain as bad as they are, the demand for public subsidy of private alternatives will continue. What is the likelihood of success in the next decade?

The tuition grant alternative provides potentially the most funds with the least public control. Conservative groups like Citizens for Educational Freedom and the White Citizens Council have suggested tuition grants in the belief that this financial pattern does not create enough state involvement in private schools to provide an excuse for public regulation of discriminatory admission practices or curriculum indoctrination. Their legal assumption may be wrong, however, since tuition grant plans have been struck down by federal courts in Virginia and Louisiana on the grounds that they were attempts to avoid desegregation and by a state court in Vermont on the grounds that the plan aided parochial schools.

The legal problems in a system of direct grants to private schools are even greater, since the state involvement is clearer and almost all state constitutions bar direct aid to parochial schools, and all federal programs require non-discriminatory policies. Furthermore, the Elementary and Secondary School Act has established the precedent of allowing programs for private school children only if there is public school administration. Although in practice this principle is sometimes ignored or circumvented, its existence is a formidable legal and political barrier to the development of the true private school alternative.

While it might be theoretically possible to design a tuition grant or direct grant program that would not assist racially-segregated or church-controlled schools, such a plan would have little political support. One of the basic problems with the private school alternative is that 90 percent of all private school enrollment is in Catholic parochial schools with only 5 percent in schools belonging to other churches and another 5 percent in non-sectarian schools. As the recent overwhelming rejection of the proposed New York State Constitution, which for the first time would have permitted aid to parochial schools suggests, enrollment patterns in existing private schools do not provide a broad enough political basis to greatly alter the existing public school monopoly of public funds. Furthermore, the Catholic Church, particularly, is having second thoughts about expanding its school system. Last week, the Marist order, which operates thirty-four schools in the United States, announced it was going to phase out the parochial school approach in favor of after-school ecumenical centers. This approach and shared-time arrangements seem more likely methods of providing religious education in the future than comprehensive parochial schools. Internal staffing problems, theological controversies, and a generally conservative outlook that seems out-of-touch with cultural trends, make it unlikely that the parochial school-oriented churches will be able to maintain their growth rates or expand their school systems. If this is true, even a sizable increase in non-sectarian college prep-type schools will not be enough to provide a traditional *private school substitute for public education in the next decade.*

This situation has led some writers to suggest that a better and quicker method of creating competitive alternatives is to permit public agencies to contract with corporations, universities and other groups to manage schools. Although the management of these schools would be private, they would remain public schools since the public agency would be able to terminate the contract at any time and since the schools would not be permitted to discriminate or indoctrinate. Some Job Corps centers have been managed in this pattern with mixed results. Antioch College is operating the Adams-Morgan district in Washington on a three-year contract and several such relationships are contemplated in New York.

I doubt, however, whether there will be a wholesale turning over of public schools to private management. For one thing, there will be tremendous political opposition among administrators, teachers, and established school groups as there was among 75 percent of the teachers in the Adams-Morgan district who requested transfers when the Antioch contract was announced. To offset this opposition there would have to be strong parental support. Ghetto parents, however, are already suspicious of corporations and universities and would prefer to run the schools themselves. Secondly, although corporations and universities might be willing to volunteer their services on a short-term altruistic basis, in the long run we would have to create profit and research-training opportunities so substantial as to undermine the utility of the schools for mass education. For example, hospitals affiliated with universities are wonderful places if you have an exotic disease, but they have never been very interested in providing day-to-day care for ordinary patients.

Short of taking over whole public school systems, there will be more private participation in public education than previously. As mentioned, shared time or dual enrollment arrangements will increase. The tremendous innovations in education technology will mean an expanded corporate role and new acceptance of educational research will bring in the universities. It is certainly conceivable that school systems will increasingly contract out food preparation, driver training and clinical services, and turn over curriculum development to universities or educational laboratories. If Berlitz has the methods and the personnel to teach basic language skills, why not permit them to do so, and let the teaching of literature and culture remain in school hands. This mix might allow the schools to utilize business efficiency, while retaining control over areas of learning that require consideration of humane values and academic freedom.

If, then, it seems likely that there will not be any massive replacement of public schools with private schools or private management, what trends in public school politics are likely? Cities without serious racial problems may expect to continue the status quo of elected or appointed boards made up of businessmen and professionals, but elsewhere the movement for parental or community controlled schools will be formidable. As Edgar Z. Friedenberg has predicted:

> Improvement in the urban schools will come when — and only when — the residents whose children attend those schools demand and get enough political power either to destroy and replace the present school bureaucracy or to impress upon it that they can no longer be patronized. In practice, both processes will occur simultaneously; as black power grows in the city, the most rigid of the teachers and administrators will flounce off into retirement — but others will adapt like the white civil servants who decided to stay on in Kenya and who continued their careers quite cheerfully, once they admitted that the natives were capable of governing, not only themselves, but them. It is, as school personnel often say, only a matter of making it perfectly clear who is in charge, and what kind of conduct will be tolerated.

The tie-in of parental control to black power ideology is unfortunately a mixed blessing. Although there is much potential good in the black power concept — the development of personal pride, the resurrection of Negro history and culture and the creation of effective economic and political power for ghetto residents, there is also an element of strident racial aggrandizement that cannot fail to harm the educational process. In those areas of New York City where ghetto parents have been given an increased role in school affairs, white staff members have been made to feel unwelcome. In the Ocean Hill-Brownville area, for example, 17 of 18 white assistant principals and most of the teachers have asked for transfers. Although there is a genuine need for more Negro staff and as Jonathan Kozel has so eloquently pointed out, many white teachers are by training or temperament incapable of reaching ghetto children, parents must not be allowed to create a racist purge in the schools. Surely the experience of all Negro southern schools, and an 80 percent Negro staff in Washington indicate that racial identity alone is not enough to create a good learning situation for Negro youth.

Even without the black power issue, participation of large numbers of lower-class parents in the making of school policy will create problems. The fact that too many decision-makers make any decision impossible will be further complicated by lower-class political participation styles which James Q. Wilson describes as "private-regarding" rather than "community-oriented" and suspicious of all leadership and parliamentary procedures. This makes communication extremely difficult even with the best of intentions by school authorities. Furthermore, despite the need that professionals see to develop new approaches and new materials to make learning more relevant for deprived youngsters, their parents often reason that what is good enough for the suburbs is good enough for them and resist experimentation and any hint of a permissive approach.

One solution may be to insist that parents share control of the schools with other parts of the community. After all, even in suburbs participation in school board and bond elections is open to all citizens. The Bundy decentralization proposal for New York City suggests local school boards made up of six members elected by the parents and five members appointed by the mayor from various community groups. This will insure parental access to the school yet provide some broader perspective. At any rate, this is the kind of pragmatic evolution of checks and balances that historically has characterized American government.

Several other trends in urban education including decentralization, metropolitanization, the community school concept, community-teacher tension, social indicators and program budgeting and, most important, the new role of mayors should be discussed.

Until very recently, the basic policy in school districting was consolidation so that in the last ten years more than 20,000 school districts disappeared in the name of efficiency and economy. Now we are discovering that districts or even particular schools of a certain size develop bureaucratic hardening of the arteries and become inflexible and impersonal. Hopefully research in this decade may be able to specify optimum sizes for various kinds of situations, but right now we have no such data. Even if thirty districts were created in New York, as Bundy proposes, they would still have 40,000 students each, and this may still be too many.

Decentralization proponents are often a strange coalition of white liberal intellectuals, white neighborhood school groups, and black militants. Ranged against them, if New York proves typical, will be administrators and teachers with promotion and tenure policies to protect, and established school groups who want to preserve their political status.

Decentralization, where it occurs, will have many consequences. One is that it may facilitate the development of true metropolitan school systems. Suburban schools may be more willing to enter into cooperative agreement with a particular city district or join a limited purpose metropolitan federation when all the districts are about the same size. Cities may want to explore a system of exchanges based on the considerable adult educational resources in the city and the suburb's secondary school advantages. One can imagine commuter rail and bus lines bringing adults into the city for business and education at 8:00 a.m. and returning with city youngsters bound for suburban educational centers. The transportation process will be reversed in the evening. A metropolitan system may also prove necessary if some of the suggestions in Hobson v. Hansen about equalizing educational resources should be enforced.

Another consequence of decentralization and community participation will be a broadening of school functions. U.S. Office of Education projections show that the greatest expansion in school enrollment in the next decade will be in what is now considered pre-school and adult education. This new clientele will join the existing clientele to demand that the community's most valuable facility be open to more people for more hours. Particularly in poorer neighborhoods of the city, the twenty-four hour a day, seven day a week community school concept will be widely implemented.

We can also expect an increase in teacher-community tensions. In the next decade, despite growing NEA militancy, if present trends continue, most urban teachers will be organized by the AFT. A period of salary and working condition conflicts would then be expected, but disputes over professional status and seniority will also grow. The concept of tenure is already under attack by ghetto parents who see it as a device to protect unsympathetic and incompetent teachers. Tenure for teachers has had a different basis than ordinary civil service protection, since teachers, unlike civil servants, expect to make institutional policy as well as to carry it out. The traditional rationale for tenure — academic freedom — will, however, be undermined by the large number of para-professionals the schools will require to meet their expanded functions. While one may grant that senior faculty in a high school history or sociology department may need the same protection as their colleagues in the university, what about the school employee who teaches driver training, or plays creatively with three-year-olds, or who programs teaching machines?

Another threat to the security of teachers and administrators will be the development and utilization of program budgeting and new concepts of social indicators.

It will be increasingly possible to measure the efficiency of one teacher, one educational approach, or one school system against another in terms the public can understand. Since educational achievement is almost always measured in relative terms and not everyone can be above the median, the development of the new measuring devices will put additional pressure on schoolmen to perform.

All of the above factors: increased parental participation, decentralization, metropolitanization, the community school concept, community-teacher conflicts and new forms of educational statistics will contribute to the paramount trend in the politics of education in the next decade — the emergence of the mayor as the chief arbiter and policy-maker for education.

The original separation of public school management from city government was mainly a middle-class Protestant strategy to keep education from falling into the hands of ethnic-dominated machine governments which they regarded as corrupt and inefficient. Machine leaders whose constituency largely preferred parochial schools anyway found this an easy concession to make to the reformers. All of this history is now irrelevant to urban politics in most places and few mayors are going to be able to hide behind the myth of keeping politics out of education. With expanded pre-school and adult education and the decline of parochial schools, public education will have a bigger constituency than ever before. In particular, the new Negro voting blocs in the city will insist that mayors be responsible for public education. Also it is increasingly clear that education cannot be treated separately from problems of housing, welfare and unemployment. Any political leader who wants to save or even improve his city is going to have to make public education a priority matter.

The mayor's intervention in school politics will mean a decline in relative power for school bureaucracies and the groups that have controlled school boards, but these groups have proven they can no longer manage public education by themselves. Isolated from the sources of political influence in the city, public schools have not had the strength to protect the public interest in financing, integration, or relations with private schools. As the number of participants increases through decentralization and as pressure group tactics become more sophisticated and more disruptive, the vulnerability of the schools will increase without a radical injection of political energy.

The changes in school politics will also create changes in city politics. As the educational level of the electorate goes up and the educational responsibility of the mayor becomes clearer, a new breed of candidates will emerge and the office of the mayor will be restructured. Communities may not be willing to entrust their school systems to the same kind of men they had previously chosen when police, fire, sanitation, etc., seemed to be the mayor's chief duties.

At some points this prognosis may have seemed overly pessimistic. I did not mean this implication, though the problems obviously will be great. In the next decade, public schools will develop a broader clientele, increased functions, and a system of government that is both more sentitive to local interests and closer to the mayor, the center of power in the city. If these political changes lead to a breakthrough in learning for ghetto children, then public education will have met its greatest challenge and its future will be bright indeed.

EDUCATION AND MUNICIPAL ACTION

David S. Seeley
Director of the Office of Education Liaison
City of New York

I presume the reason I was invited here was to explain the existence of an Office of Educational Liaison in the New York City Mayor's Office. Why should any big city mayor find it necessary to appoint a chief education officer when the complex machinery of urban education is managed by other hands? Furthermore, does not the existence of this office represent an unwarranted political intrusion into the sacrosanct chambers of education? I can assure you that many of my friends in the school systems feel very much that that is the case.

To these honest questions I think that I should give forthright answers. These questions proceed, I think, from a false assumption about the separation of education and politics. I realize that these thoughts are becoming more respectable to talk about. I hope I will be able to shed extra light on the current philosophy that education and politics are not so divided. I am sure that the whole spirit of this conference — certainly as I absorbed it in the last half hour of this morning's session — recognizes that this separation no longer exists. But I also detected a fair amount of uneasiness about what does exist in its place, if they're no longer separated. It's really about this that I'll be talking.

Unfortunately, the myth that politics and education do not mix persists even amongst our most knowledgeable and concerned educators. Recently, one respected and committed New York educator said to me in connection with the Bundy proposal for decentralization that, "We want to do something to help these children who are not learning. But we don't want to do something political; we want to do something educational." I submit to you that my respected and committed friend revealed a point of view that is not only wrong but dangerous.

Today education — at least in our large cities — IS politics. And, in a sense, the reverse is also true — that politics involves education. The two are necessarily intertwined and inseparable. One can no longer consider urban education apart from politics. The reason that we can no longer consider them apart is not only political, but it is educational as well. What the journalists euphemistically refer to as the "Urban School Crisis" cannot, in my opinion, be abated without recourse to political mechanisms. Increasingly, the complexities of cities are breaking down the barriers that have compartmentalized our lives. Perhaps the city school may once have been able to function independently of mayor and citizen. Today, however, the insularity of the "urban fortress school"— as my previous associate Mr. Keppell called it — from the public only guarantees failure in our classrooms. We are all too familiar with the dismal statistics that one out of three youngsters in New York City schools are at least one year behind and a goodly number are two to four years behind by the time they are in the fifth grade. And four out of five students in the Washington, D.C., school system are one or more years behind. This alarming rate of failure in urban education should not be thought of only as a failure of our schools. I believe that we must think of this as a failure of our society. I do not mean this in a defensive way, the way a school administrator would mean it — defensively. What I mean is that our whole society is at fault, and we must look at the problems of our schools as part of the larger problems of society. By saying that it is the school's fault or the school saying that it is society's fault, we are in effect trying to separate something that cannot be thought of as separate. We must remember that although many children are not learning to read and understand mathematics, large numbers are also not learning how to grow up to be fruitful and constructive adults. I was particularly impressed the other day when conducting one of the hearings on the Bundy proposal. A young leader of CORE got up and expressed his concern, not only about the lack of academic achievement in the ghetto, but about his concern that students were not learning to behave. He said that parents and teachers must begin to work together to resolve this problem. Then he said, "They can't work together in the present state of isolation of the school from the rest of society."

This means, in effect, that the educational problems in our cities are not just pedagogical problems requiring solely a professional solution. They are social problems requiring the attention and effort of the entire society. In other words, solution must involve the political machinery of the entire society. Only through political means can we reestablish our urban schools as academically and socially effective institutions in the cities.

As a procedural matter, the appointment of an education officer by the mayor of New York signifies a bold departure in American urban education. The involvement of politics in education is certainly not a new thing. Many of our important educational decisions were also political decisions. As Professor Lawrence A. Cremin so ably points out in his The American Common School, the system of public education evolved from political and social forces of the post-Civil War period and continued to develop along the lines of society's demands until the advent of World War I. Certainly, other important educational decisions were also political decisions. The Morrill Land Grant College Act of 1862, providing colleges for agriculture and mechanical arts, was adopted because the body politic decided that we must move beyond the classical curriculum of the eastern education establishment. Similarly, the decision of the Congress at the time of the first World War to establish a system of vocational education represented the concern of business and other forces that something must be done to change the product and purpose of our public schools so they could better serve society.

In the last fifty years, the myth of the public school as something insulated from the body politic has flourished. As a result, many of us have mistakenly come to regard the system of public schools in every town, county, and city as one that must be maintained only by the professional educators. This illusion of public school systems unaccountable to the public arose in part from the proper protection of teachers and supervisors through the merit system or civil service system. The political clubhouse chicanery was an unfortunate heritage of the early days of public education — at least in our cities and I suspect in our small towns as well. Such clubhouse influence in teacher appointments may be responsible for whatever evil connotations come to mind when one thinks of politics or politics in education. As a result, many have come to believe that it is the professional who is ultimately responsible and who must remain solely responsible for the education of our children. There is no need, they feel, for the injection of public policy or to use the more blatant term — politics — in our schools.

The rise of progressive education during the twenties, reinforced the notion that professionals were primarily responsible for the shape and content of American education. During the Depression, the sense of the professional's worth made him feel that he alone could be the saving element in American society. We all remember the challenge of one of our scholarly colleagues, "Dare we build a new social order, we, the educators, since everyone else seems to have fallen apart and is unable to cope with the situation?" The schools, he suggested, might become the catalytic agent to refurbish society.

In the forties, educators were gearing their programs for educating the whole child for life or life's adjustments. The schools were seen as an all-embracing institution going beyond academic skills to include training in ethics, health, and personal development.

In the last generation the demands of society have changed drastically and so have the goals of the public schools. No longer are the schools primarily responsible for preparing an elite for college while preparing a majority of students with elementary literacy needed by the blue collar worker. Today, the technological society requires an entirely different system of education. Instead of putting only seven percent of an age group through a high school education as we did 50 years ago, the demands of society require us to find a way to give a decent high school education to virtually every student as a bare minimum if he's going to survive economically and socially.

It was in the 1950's that the technological impact began to affect the direction of public education. The missile gap raised serious questions about the educational aims and practices of the schools, questions that ultimately were again politically decided or at least heavily determined by the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

In the 1960's, the racial and poverty gap raised other serious questions. We realized that an entire segment of our population was educationally discriminated against and failing to learn. Once again the response was political. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Poverty Program, the idea of giving children a Head Start, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 — all of these represented a reaction expressed through the political process by the body politic to the problems that were upon us.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, as some of you remember, directed the Office of Education to eliminate segregation. It was an effort that I directed in Washington as Assistant Commissioner for two years, without much success and with the production of a great deal of hostility. I think this clearly represented a political reaction of the society. It was recognized as such by those school systems that felt this was a political intrusion in their educational system made by the Office of Education. And yet, as I used to enjoy pointing out, the institution that the Supreme Court and the Congress were saying must go — mainly the dual school system in the 17 southern states — was established politically and not educationally. This was a decision of the body politic in those states where social values and political traditions required the schools be established in a certain way. Segregated schools developed not because educators said this was an efficient way to educate, but because society said this is the way we want to organize our society and these are the values we want to maintain.

The political and constitutional demand to abandon the dual school system has been traumatic in many ways, and it was recognized as an outside force upon the schools. Most of the other political impacts upon the schools in recent years have occurred within the structure of the public school system. The fact that this structure has basically remained intact contributes further to the illusion that public schools, as institutions, somehow are removed from the processes of politics. It is against this backdrop of institutional isolation that Mayor Lindsay's recent efforts to devise more viable educational strategies have achieved some national significance, and controversy, I might add.

This afternoon I would like to mention two of the things we are working on in New York. First, let me describe the purposes and reasons for the establishment of my office — the Office of Educational Liaison, and then discuss the Bundy proposals to decentralize the school system.

The Office of Educational Liaison, as part of the Mayor's office, serves to establish effective relationships between the school and the community and develop a city-wide educational context and strategy within which the schools and the colleges can best carry out their missions. The Office of Educational Liaison also defines and evaluates educational objectives and the means to achieve these goals through collaboration with the City's Bureau of the Budget. The purpose of the Budget Bureau is to coordinate the analysis of effective means of achieving all goals of the City government. In other words, I have been asked by the Mayor and the Budget Director to find some way of constructively relating the city government to the school system. It was pointed out this morning, that the school is fiscally dependent because it must secure its funds from the city. But it is totally independent in terms of any kind of scrutiny by the city administration as to how these monies are being spent, whether they are being spent effectively. Before I arrived, the Mayor took some action in this area. I am convinced that those actions have not been the right steps. We have not yet found a productive way to relate. The use of some kind of line item control from the city administration would be the worst possible kind of harrassment rather than help. We do think that the budget approach that Fred Hayes is trying to bring to the rest of the city administration, in terms of an analysis of how monies are spent and how they can be more effectively coordinated with other City programs, is the technique that can be related to the evaluation of the school budget as well.

The Office of Educational Liaison, in addition to these activities, helps to coordinate the educational programs of the various poverty programs. It is for this reason that my office is a part of the new super agency that Mayor Lindsay is creating, called the "Human Resources Administration," which Mr. Sviridoff headed until yesterday. As you know, Mr. Ginsberg will now direct that office. The Human Resources Administration is only a year old and we are still trying to organize it. But I do think that, in concept, it is directly relevant to the entire work that you are trying to do in model cities. It embodies the notion that we cannot solve the problems of the cities except in some kind of coordinative effort.

The Bundy Report, as you know, derives its name from McGeorge Bundy, head of the Ford Foundation. He was named by the Mayor to draw up proposals for the decentralization of the school system. They have created the biggest stir that we have had in the City since the Dodgers moved to the West Coast. It is really extraordinary how much debate has been caused by a fairly scholarly document put together by six relatively quiet people meeting over the summer. Everyone is now talking about education and the school people have emerged from their isolation to oppose the recommendations in the Report.

The Bundy panel proposed a sweeping set of recommendations to revitalize the educational system of the city. The school bureaucracy has spoken against the proposals in the name of separation of education and politics as well as for a number of other reasons. Part of the outcry is over the fact that the State Legislature, almost by accident, directed the Mayor, rather than the Board of Education, to develop a plan to decentralize the schools in order to receive $54 million in the first year and $100 million thereafter in state aid. The critics viewed this legislation as purely political and outside the protective world of education. But the Bundy panel and the State Legislature are advancing a political principle, namely, that the major responsibility for city education must be in the hands of the public if it is going to work. What the Bundy Report recommends is the restoration of the balance between the public and professional responsibility for education that many people feel has shifted too far in the direction of professional monopoly and harmful isolation of the schools as an institution in the city. The transfer of urban educational responsibility would be accomplished, under the proposals, by the creation of 30 to 60 local school boards. The school boards would be largely autonomous and have the necessary budgetary powers to carry out their own purposes with a balance maintained between the local boards and the central board of education. There would be significant responsibility in the local boards to operate the schools in their particular area of the City.

The boards would be composed of six representatives elected indirectly through parent assemblies and five persons chosen by the Mayor from a panel of names provided by the Central Board of Education. The community boards would determine their own school policies and choose the educators to administer those policies. In other words, they would choose their own district superintendent; he in turn would nominate principals for approval by the local board rather than receiving assigned principals and other administrators from a central list.

The decentralization principle extends to neighborhoods in the City the political prerogatives of education that most school districts throughout the nation enjoy. Unfortunately, there are two educational systems in America — one for the city and one for the rest of the country. One is insulated and responsible to no one. The other is intended to reflect the needs and desires of the people that it was created to serve. Governor Rockefeller tersely captured this educational schizophrenia when he said that we have a double system of education in New York State. In the "big six" cities — New York, Yonkers, Rochester, Syracuse, Albany, and Buffalo — there is a city-wide school board appointed by the mayor. In the rest of the state, there are school districts and the people elect their own school board. Essentially, the Bundy Report is a political response to society's demand to make city schools accountable to those that they serve.

Perhaps the most unfortunate side effect of the failure of urban education has been to create a "Crisis of Confidence." Parents feel that they can do as well as the educators in managing the urban education system. This reaction may be natural, but it is also a by-product of deep distrust of the motives and abilities of the teachers. Parents feel they cannot safely hand over the education of their children to teachers with the assurance that all will turn out well. This crisis of confidence in New York City has erupted on numerous occasions in hostile confrontations between parents and teachers so that the natural alliance between parent and teacher has been disrupted. Yet, no system, I am convinced, can be effective unless the parent has confidence in the professionals who operate the schools.

In the big cities this confidence can never exist as long as the implacable school door remains shut with parents on the outside and with defensive educational bureaucrats manning the barricade. Although this may sound blunt, it is exactly as it appears to the outsider at least. I know it does not appear that way to dedicated educators on the inside. It is incredible in New York City and I am sure elsewhere, that the voices of virtually everyone outside the school system are almost unanimous in seeing the school man inside the system in this light — as a bureaucrat who is defensive, who is hiding behind his barricade, and who will not venture forth for real involvement with those who are outside the defenses of the barricade.

For the ghetto parent, there is a double sense of urgency to restore the schools to the public. Current educational wisdom has shown that compensatory educational programs have little effect on the achievement of the Negro poor. The only significant study which does record noticeable academic achievement among the Negro poor is the Coleman Report commissioned by the Office of Education which finds that social integration in the classroom has a bearing on how Negro children perform. The key lies with the raised aspirations of the Negro children who will presumably share the optimism of their white middle-class schoolmates. This occurs because the teacher relates to the middle-class school situation in a different way than in an all Negro ghetto school situation. When the Negro pupil is integrated he feels that his classroom effort has some impact upon his future and that he can exercise some control over his destiny. Indeed, a sense of control over one's destiny was the second factor the Coleman Study found had a significant relation to learning.

With the realities of urban school integration being what they are, the next logical step in trying to find a key to real education in our poor neighborhoods is to try to remove the atmosphere of a distantly controlled colonial authority and reestablish an atmosphere of individual and community responsibility. The hostile reaction of professional organization in New York City reflects, I think, a cultural lag among school men. Most of this adverse reaction is predicated on a misplaced fear of politics. In a speech to another workshop for the Model Cities program, Stephen Bailey aptly pointed out the necessity for educators to become politically sensitive.

> "School men are now being forced into the wider political community. Unless they change their viewpoint and attitude, they will find themselves in a coliseum of combat in which outstanding gladiators or even 'wild beasts' from myriad agencies of government and politics and from private and parochial interests will outsmart and outfight him. It does not have to be this way, but if the outward reach of school men is timid, defensive, reluctant, fearful, protective, indecisive and scattered, they face infinite frustration and enmity and, in some cases, disaster. If, on the other hand, school men can enter the broader political community in a spirit of cooperation, concern, dignified compromise, and political reciprocity, they can establish a role of significant and valued leadership across the spectrum of community planning."

I wish that statement could be read and reread by most of my educational colleagues in the city. I think in spite of much good will on their part they are suffering from an attitudinal stance that is aptly described by the list of adjectives that Stephen Bailey puts forth. You cannot help but see this from men who are strong in their own institution but in the outside world they are timid, defensive, reluctant, fearful, protective, indecisive, and scattered. It is a tragic and sad thing, not only for the individuals but a dangerous situation for our public schools, because these are the people that are desperately needed to lead us out of the morass that we are now in. This last comment about the leadership potential of educators brings me to my last point — politics is education.

We have mentioned the political notion that has characterized our decade, that of participation. Mr. Alinsky represents a particular corner of that dialogue of participation, but whether it is Alinsky or the Poverty Act itself, participation of the poor is the rhetoric and the reality of our poverty program. Participation of the public in local school boards is the principle of American education and the principle of the Bundy plan and the state legislation that brought it into being.

The new style of American politics, particularly in our cities, has swerved away from the closed corporations of the ward heelers and the clubhouse. More citizens are able to take part in the political life of the city and significant decisions are no longer the province of the back room. The political processes of today constitute an educative force and political participation in the institutions of our society has a prime educative effect. The local school board is a training ground of democracy. Issues are discussed in a multitude of committees and community organization in our cities, and they are being discussed in the public media and on TV.

Big city mayors have a political responsibility as educators, specifically to educate the public on civic issues. Mayor Lindsay, as you know, has inaugurated a weekly television program to explain and discuss the problems of the city to the public. What does the Mayor's political responsibility to the public mean? First, it does not mean that the mayor of New York City wants to run the schools. His function is not to encroach on the legal prerogatives of the school system, and here I may be disagreeing with some comments made this morning as to the need for increased power for the mayor. I do not think that is the key to our problems. It means, however, that the mayor has a responsibility to orchestrate the needs of the city and the schools by educating the public about what has to be done. The Mayor's role and, consequently, my role, is to serve as a broker of ideas, a crystallizer of issues for the public and a catalyst for action.

Education is not simply the practice of pedagogy. Education, if it is to be real, represents an active will of the entire society. Schools fulfill part of that will. We in government must strive to keep the schools in touch with the larger society and work to make them effective and viable institutions. In conclusion, the school and city hall are not enemies. The future of each depends on the other. What I would say to my colleagues in education is this. "We, as educators, cannot help the children in our city's schools, educationally, unless and until we are ready and willing to do something politically."

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN DEPRIVED NEIGHBORHOODS

Saul D. Alinsky
Executive Director
Industrial Areas Foundation

I want to examine with you the issue of local community involvement – particularly low-income communities – in such city problems as schools, city planning, and urban renewal. Furthermore, I want to examine the relationship between people and public authority, in education and in general government. Certain philosophical points should be kept in mind because they manifest themselves in all kinds of ways, some crude and subtle.

People in this nation are schizoid in terms of their convictions and commitments about the democratic way of life. We profess trust and belief in the people, yet while we do this verbally, emotionally we follow an elitist approach in which only experts, people with shingles from institutions of alleged higher learning, are qualified to make various decisions. The mass of the people are viewed as incompetents. A public relations program caters to them and maneuvers them so they feel they participate in and are represented by government and other institutions in society. But usually they are not.

The issue of democracy versus aristocracy is the very same issue that involved Hamilton in the Federalist Papers. Hamilton asked: "Are we going to take illiterate and propertyless people [today we call them the jobless and unemployed], who constitute the large mass of colonialists, and give them an equal vote with the educated and propertied elements, the 'responsible' people?" If you go through the arguments you see that Hamilton – like Jefferson, Jay, and Madison – was a political realist who drew heavily, as did the others, on a real understanding of the world as it is and the way he would like it to be.

Democratic philosophy is now developing in a way that approaches a system of aristocracy. The need for more education, more property, and other requirements are increasing until the whole democratic way may be lost. In the world as it is you never have a choice of what is best. It is always a choice made in terms of alternatives, and if the alternatives are between an unrealized democracy and aristocracy, the choice is obvious. But that issue has never been resolved.

The issue came up constantly during the Community Action Program days of the Office of Economic Opportunity. You all recall that Hamiltonian saying about the "maximum feasible" participation of the poor. One mayor of a very large city, I am not going to name it, asked why the poor should be represented in these programs. After all, he asked, "What do they know? If they knew anything they wouldn't be poor." This is the issue presented by Hamilton, but he did it in more refined language.

Let me suggest this to you, particularly those in the field of education. You go into a slum of any kind — Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Appalachian, Black — and ask the people there, "What's wrong with schools here?"

> "Well, they stink."
> "Allright, what else?"
> "The teacher's no good."
> "What do you mean they're no good?"
> "Well, they're no good."
> "What would you do to change things?"
> "What do you mean, what would I do? I'd change the schools."
> "But what would you change?"

If you kept up this interchange, one of two things would happen. You might provoke a hostile emotional reaction, something like "Look Whitey, you people did this to the schools, you figure it out." Or he might end the conversation by leaving.

After that type of conversation you might ask: "What do these people have to contribute? Why are they selected to work with principals and educators? Are they appointed for window-dressing purposes or do they have a contribution to make?" These questions highlight the confrontation between democratic and aristocratic principles.

It is true that the poor are unfamiliar with the operation of schools and have few constructive suggestions to make. But there is not any reason for them to know. They feel powerless to change things. This principle applies to mankind generally, regardless of income or race. People who feel they can do nothing about problems will not give any thought to the development of solutions.

Once a community is organized and develops power, it can bring about change. Power is defined by Webster as the "ability to act." When the poor have the ability to bring about change and alter their condition, our symbolic conversation between an affluent and a poor person about schools would be very different. Factors such as teacher turnover and the characteristics of quality instruction would now be analyzed. These are basic and vital educational questions, as everyone in education understands. Statements will appear such as, "Why don't we ask some of these specialists and educators to come here and talk to us. We don't have to accept everything, but maybe they have half an idea."

With the ability to effectuate change, the poor ask penetrating questions, the right questions, and search for the answers. You find that a real partnership is possible between the uneducated and the expert. I am suggesting that you keep this in mind. For if people had the opportunity and power to do things, a bona fide opportunity, then your faith in democracy would be fortified. And it is important to get it fortified, if your goal is the development of democracy.

I would like to make several more points. One, the question of democratic values has to be considered. Let me talk about planning as an illustration. A favorite anecdote often discussed in planning conventions concerns a project in Chicago called "The Back of the Yards Council." This is a community that 18 years ago developed its own conservation and urban renewal program without the use of public funds. Jane Jacobs highlighted this community in the Death and Life of American Cities. The community did its own planning and developed a series of ranch-type homes costing about $17,000 each. The homes were constructed particularly for the low middle-income group.

One ranch house became a source of great amusement among professional planners. The house had a very large picture window overlooking a dill pickle factory. Professional planners chuckled to themselves about this because, to them, it indicated the ineptitude of the builders. This perspective, however, underscores two contrasting viewpoints about freedom of choice.

Individual families helped to design their own homes. They were built after the people decided what they wanted. In this instance, the family and some others regarded that pickle factory as a beautiful view. Planners, and all of us sitting here, might consider it to be an atrocious thing to look on, but to the family it was as beautiful as Lake Louise is to us.

Who, in a free and open society, is to decide what is beautiful? Are professional planners to have the authority to say to a family in that type of community, "You shall not look out on a dill pickle factory. We don't care whether you think it's beautiful. The important thing is we don't think it's beautiful." I suggest this episode be kept in mind.

A particularly threatening problem confronting our whole society is the movement into a computerized and cybernetic form of economy and society. There is an increasing depersonalization and disinvolvement of citizens from political life. When I use the word "political" I am using it strictly in the Greek sense, as the art of human coexistence — people who can work together without killing each other. A dictionary would define political as the science of government, but that is identical to the Greek definition. The Democratic and Republican party labels have no meaning here.

As people disengage from political life, as they drop out, it seems that the nation is going into a state of mass schizophrenia. Dramatic episodes underscore this point. About four or five years ago a girl was murdered in front of 36 witnesses. When the witnesses were asked by reporters from the New York Times why they did not call the police, they all reiterated that "they did not want to be involved." This theme has appeared on buttons bearing the inscription, "God is not dead, He just doesn't want to be involved." Disengagement from political life appears in many other forms. An extremely serious case is the hippie movement where we find complete disinvolvement.

I believe deTocqueville was right when he analyzed our democratic way of life in 1835. He was trying to speculate on our future. deTocqueville wrote that if many citizens began to feel locked out of the nation's decision-making processes, a dangerous situation might occur. Voting every four years would not quell this feeling of powerlessness, for voting would be utterly irrelevant. In this kind of situation, the people are in danger of losing their liberty, for an individual could navigate the tides of frustration to become a dictator.

On another point, deTocqueville predicted that, and this was in 1835, if the nation was to survive, a revolution in Negro rights was necessary. The nation could not survive if a substantial sector of the people were politically, economically, and socially disenfranchised.

The situation described by deTocqueville is present today. How do we get our citizens involved? This was the problem faced by the OEO. Very few industries or public authorities have the necessary ingredients for getting the poor involved in political life. And once you get people involved, you need a context of circumstances that permits the emergence of legitimate, bona fide representatives from the deprived community. This is necessary for when the mayor of a city turns to them, he knows who these people represent, how much they represent, and that they, in fact, do speak for this sector of the population.

When Mayor Daley, for example, wants to talk to Woodlawn, he speaks to Art Brasner. Daley understands that he is talking to The Woodlawn Organization for Brasner knows the number of organizations and the power conflicts that are involved there. My alma mater, the University of Chicago, bitterly condemned TWO in its days of formation, but today it is a staunch ally of TWO. Reconciliation you must know — or to use the old Goldwater expression, "deep down in your hearts you know" — means that when one side gets the power the other side gets reconciled to it. You then have consensus, cooperation, or reconciliation. A similar development occurred in Rochester, New York, where my colleague and I created a dialogue between Eastman Kodak and FIGHT. We even had a seminar for Kodak executives at Harvard during the late summer.

When Mayor Daley wants to talk to representatives of the community in other parts of the City, it's a serious question who he can talk with. He could not possibly have the kind of situation that exists in Woodlawn. There, cooperation between the City and the residents of Woodlawn in urban renewal is joint and complete. This is citizen participation. The community not only had authority to plan its own redevelopment but, as you know, was its own developer. Full cooperation and support existed between the City and Woodlawn.

A community is organized when a significant segment of its churches, clubs, and organizations combine together to adopt a constitution and elect officers. They can then turn to other communities and say: "Here are our representatives. These people represent us. You talk to them." Unless you have that situation, you do not have an understanding of communication no matter how well-intentioned you are.

Let us assume that tomorrow morning the powers in Detroit suddenly said: "Look, everything we've done in the past has been wrong. We have operated as though the Negroes in Detroit were in segregated ghettos and have treated them as natives. We've been a colonial occupying power and have operated on what can be called a policy of welfare colonialism. Our major premise was to keep the animals quiet so we wouldn't have trouble. We've sent our colonial emissaries, and our former recreation and delinquency workers to the ghetto. All that's been wrong. No matter how we try to disguise it, this is the way we operate. From now on, we are going to operate as equals, as freemen working together."

The influentials in Detroit can ask the Negro community to "send us your representatives." Who's going to come? You have people talking about "black power," but they have few followers. They have developed an emotional empathy in the community in terms of expressing a basic attitude of anti-white hostility, but who in fact do they represent? They are not organized. They do not have a mandate from any particular community saying, "This man speaks for us." To a significant extent, they are self-appointed emissaries.

I am suggesting that unless your communities are organized, you do not have anyone with whom to talk. You have no way to work out agreements. You have no one to cooperate with. The days when community disorganization worked was when people selected "Uncle Tom's" from their communities — businessmen and so forth — for service on "little blue ribbon" committees. These people lived in the community and assumed they were representing the community. Those days are ended.

It is not possible to fall back on that kind of camouflage when confronted with a serious situation. I am saying this assuming that you are sincerely trying to make the democratic process work. The democratic process cannot work unless the legitimate interests of the poor are represented.

Rochester, New York, can serve as an example. About three years ago, the first confrontation occurred between myself and its power structure. An official of Eastman Kodak turned to me and said, "When you say, Mr. Alinsky, that the Negroes in Rochester have absolutely no representation on any body, whether it be urban renewal, poverty, or anything else, you are guilty of a vile, malicious distortion. The fact is that we have a Negro Ph.D. on our payroll. We put him on every committee to represent the Negro community."

This may appear to be a very grotesque caricature. What he was saying applied to Rochester, but Rochester isn't very different from any other place in the country. They just do things more stupidly and more crassly. For example, you have the city's two newspapers. I always have to force out the term "newspapers." They can be described as two rolls of toilet paper that appear one in the morning and one in the afternoon. Rochester is not very different from any other city in America where the white power administration appoints people in the community who are their lackeys and then states "they represent the community."

My home town of Chicago goes to extremes on things. Other cities had gangsters, we had Al Capone. Many cities have had odd kinds of newspapers; Chicago had an odd newspaper publisher. It is not every town that has a newspaper publisher who will pull down the American flag after Rhode Island passed social security. Chicago also has about the worst "representative" of the Negro community in America, yet he often serves on many committees for the Mayor. There probably is not an individual held in greater contempt by the black people of the city. I think they would vote for the Grand Leader of the Ku Klux Klan ahead of him.

This type of situation creates a real dilemma. Communities need to organize for power, for organization and power are synonymous. The only reason anybody ever organizes is to have the ability to put certain ideas into practice. Without community power gained through organization, public agencies will be paralyzed in trying to involve citizens in cooperative ventures.

I am going to touch on several other points. I would doubt very seriously whether the job of organizing the poor can be done by either the national or city governments. We saw the experience of CAP with federal funds.

Let me talk about Chicago and Mayor Daley in this regard. Daley and I have had our exchanges as anyone here from Chicago knows. He is the last of a breed of mayors who really likes his town and the people. He is very different from mayors in other towns, including some towns rather close by, who look upon the mayoralty as some kind of stepping stone to higher public office. To Daley, being Mayor of Chicago is important, it is being number one. It is not just a pony express stop on the way to someplace. I've always respected him on this basis.

Mayor Daley was not going to allow federal funds to be used in developing an independent community organization and program that could challenge the authority of city hall. This would be like assuming that a company president would hire a labor organizer and turn him loose among the workers to unite them into a labor union. The labor union might then turn around and call a strike against the company. The company president then would hire organizers to break the union which is exactly what mayors have done under OEO's program. CAP programs were permitted so long as they were good city hall "company operations."

President Johnson announced in his last budget message that CAP action groups could no longer engage in demonstrations or partisan politics. You can only work for cleaner alleys and street lights because non-partisan people wear tunic tombstones for hats. However, nothing in life is non-partisan. Organizing the poor cannot be done by private or voluntary agencies, such as community chests, because they are completely dominated by a professionalized, colonial philosophy. Rochester, New York, is an example.

Four settlement houses in the ghetto joined FIGHT. FIGHT is the name of a non-violent organization in Rochester. After it was organized, what happened? The Community Chest promptly issued an announcement that their budgets were going to be re-evaluated. Aid is not coming from these organizations. Furthermore, we have quite a civil war developing in the field of social work. Many young college graduates, and I have been speaking at practically every college in the country and to a great many of the social service schools, now identify with people, issues, and causes. No longer are they simply attuned to a professional career and with things like the Community Chest.

My estimation is that organizational operations must be initiated by the private sector. We happen to be a private sector. Certain foundations may be able to do it, but even then you find there are problems. For example, foundations want to avoid anything involving controversy.

Why is it that we always go in for controversy? This is what people ask us. We do, I will plead guilty on that. But we do not "rub raw the sources of resentment," a remark often attributed to me. Of course we don't agitate. Do you think my associates or I go into a black ghetto after we have been invited and say,

> "Let's all gather round, we want to tell you something. Do you know that you are being discriminated against? Do you know what white society does to you? Do you know what happens when you try to get a job or when you try to move into a white neighborhood?"

Do you think we have to do that? Of course, we don't, but three things happen.

First, when a community that has surrendered and feels there is nothing it can do, that there isn't any future, that things are pretty hopeless when such a community sees that through organization it can change its way of life, then they do have something. They have the power to speak and become involved in decision-making. They can stand up and see that they are on the move. The rest of the city, however, looks over there and says, "See, we told you. Everything was nice until Alinsky went in there with his people and rabble-roused and agitated and rubbed raw the sores of resentment. Now look at them."

Everything was nice, but nice for whom? All that happens is that people now are speaking up for themselves. This is not rubbing raw resentments; the resentments have always been there. The poor have created a combination of circumstances that involves organization. The poor can do something about deprivation and they are involved.

Second, when you organize people, you organize them around issues. You cannot organize them on anything else. If there is a general rule in the formation of new organizations, it is that issues must be immediate, specific, and involve the self-interests of the people. Self-interest is a prime moving force. Issues must be immediate. Any issue that is as far off as a year, or two years, or even ten months becomes an abstraction. For example, when students enter this University they know that final examinations will be administered at the end of the semester. But students do not begin to study for them on the first day of classes. It is when the examination becomes immediate that they begin to concentrate.

Third, people should undertake to bring about changes that are possible. There is no point in organizing for something you cannot do. It is useless to go to a lot of meetings if nothing can be done. These, then, are your three major compass points.

Let me suggest that there is no such thing as a non-controversial issue. It is a contradiction in terms. When you and I agree on something, we have no issue. The only time that the issue is joined is when we disagree. The book I am now completing involves certain rules about change. The first universal rule is that change means movement, movement means friction, friction means heat, and heat means controversy. It is the same law that applies in the field of physical mechanics and it is just as germane in the field of social mechanics. The only possible places where you can get movement without friction is either in outer space or in a conference.

Change is impossible without friction. The minute you have change, things are moved about. People resist change because they do not want to give up their status and powers. Since they are organized, change is a difficult process.

Anyone who talks about a disorganized community does not know what he is talking about. Wherever people are together you have organization. You may not like the organization and its leadership, but it exists.

I cannot understand why we emphasize the idea of cooperation. If you really want consensus and cooperation — or that other idea you talk about, collaboration — go to a totalitarian society where everyone cooperates, and everyone gets cremated.

The democratic system is founded on conflict. Controversy is the very matrix, the very cradle, of everything creative. The minute a new idea is initiated it challenges the prevailing idea and you have conflict. It is the give and take, the shoving, the pressure groups — black power, Catholic power, labor power, Boston Irish power, Italian power, or whatever other kind of power you want — that produces our free society.

Conflict is present in Congress particularly in congressional committees. When a piece of legislation is debated, legislators attach amendments to it in order to satisfy the demands of various individuals and interest groups. This is the democratic process. It is the process of compromise. Compromise is a process that is always on-going and never subject to cancellation.

The most vicious, most subversive, doctrine that has ever permeated the American body politic has been developed by the public relations men of Madison Avenue. The doctrine stresses a middle class moral hygiene that makes controversy and conflict ugly words. It glorifies the necessity of being an absolutely homogenized, desanitized, and deodorized robot. Getting along with everybody without hurting anyone's feelings is the important purpose of life. This notion is emphasized on American television every day. Individuals must not have odors or smells that emanate from their body or mouth. Do not offend anyone and democracy will function smoothly.

The democratic system is dynamic. Its whole spirit is a very offensive one. Compromise is fundamental to its operation, for this is what makes America a free and open society. Compromise is not a bad word. It's a word that defines the essence of democracy. Without compromise our life would be dominated by the idea that might makes right.

Compromise does not exist without power factions and a citizenry that is aware of the dangers inherent in consensus and personal disinvolvement. If a man speaks on the issues and is promptly labeled a troublemaker, or agitator, or radical, the United States is in danger. The danger is not from what the "troublemaker" states. The danger is that an apathetic and unconcerned citizenry will not meet the challenges of contemporary society.

3

NEW EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Clifton R. Jones
Associate Professor of Sociology
Howard University

The term disadvantaged has been defined in a variety of ways, depending upon the particular emphasis on discipline in which it is used.[1] While the definitions of the term may vary there is general agreement among its users on the characteristics of the disadvantaged. These are as follows: (1) the disadvantaged earn low and inadequate income; (2) they are frequently unemployed or underemployed; (3) they have a low level of educational achievement; (4) the children often test one or more grades below their grade level, many are underachievers, and a considerable number become dropouts; (5) there is a low level of participation on their part in those cultural activities which society regards as desirable for all its citizens. One might also add that these estimates vary with respect to the size of this population. Based on the poverty line of $3,000 a year for a family of four, it is estimated that 20 percent of the population — 40,000,000 individuals,[2] or some 10,000,000 families — live in poverty. Moreover, while poverty exists in rural communities and may be even worse than it is in cities, poverty is becoming more and more an urban problem, as Professor Gordon has observed,[3] and as you yourselves must be aware.

More important than the fact that most of the poor and the disadvantaged live in cities is the fact that they tend to be concentrated in specific areas in cities where the rates of unemployment are as much as five times the national rate, and sometimes even higher for the specific city, according to a study of the U.S. Department of Labor reported in November, 1966.[4]

---

[1] Robert J. Havighurst, "Who are the Socially Disadvantaged," Frost and Hawkes, The Disadvantaged Child, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966, p. 15.

[2] Nathan Glazer, "A Sociologist's View of Poverty," Poverty in America, ed. Margaret S. Gordon, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1965, p. 13.

[3] R. A. Gordon, "An Economist's View of Poverty," ed. Margaret S. Gordon, op. cit., p. 9.

[4] Susan S. Holland, "The Employment Situation for Negroes," Employment and Earnings and Monthly Report of the Labor Force, U.S. Department of Labor, 14: (September, 1967), pp. 11-19.

It is also significant to note the racial composition of this segment of the population. Although numerically poor and disadvantaged whites outnumber poor and disadvantaged nonwhites, the latter — largely Negroes — constitute a disproportionate share of the poor. Of the 7,000,000 families in poverty in 1963, 2,000,000 were nonwhite.[5] It is worthy of note in this connection that Negro families tend to be larger than white families. Furthermore, in view of the higher rate of urbanization of the Negro population, the problem of the urban poor and disadvantaged is, in a very real sense, the problem of the urban Negro.

In view of the high rates of unemployment and underemployment among the disadvantaged a number of programs have been developed to alleviate the problem. Among these programs are Neighborhood Youth Corps, Job Corps, Apprenticeship programs, and On-The-Job training programs. The hard cold facts faced by each of these programs was that the disadvantaged had neither the saleable skills that the job openings required, nor did they have sufficient formal education to pass tests for entry into an industry or occupation. In recognition of these deficiencies many of these programs provided training in a specific skill and basic education as well. As a general rule, training was for a specific skill in the traditional occupational pattern. Unfortunately, at the end of the training period there were no jobs available. Naturally those who had undergone the training and were not placed were disappointed. On the other hand, many were employed and continue to be employed.

One of the most promising programs to emerge in the War on Poverty is the New Careers program. The legislation which made this program possible was signed into law as an amendment to Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act on November 8, 1966. In essence the act provides for the development of projects to assist disadvantaged persons wherever possible to secure or qualify for entry-level jobs involving the use or acquisition of skills needed for subprofessional or other career opportunities offering promise of regular or continued advancement.[6] At the present time the minimum age is 22. While there is no upper limit there is a tendency to concentrate efforts on those in the lower age levels. This would appear to be a desirable step in view of the high unemployment rate among the disadvantaged in the 16-19 age group.[7]

---

[5] Herman P. Miller, "Changes in the Number and Composition of the Poor," ed. Margaret S. Gordon, op. cit., pp. 81-92.

[6] R. A. Nixon, Legislative Dimensions of the New Careers Program, New York: New York University Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, 1967, p. 8.

[7] Susan S. Holland, op. cit., p. 15

The New Careers program is, in a sense, a break with traditional patterns of finding employment for the disadvantaged. It proposes to develop a subprofessional group of workers within certain established professions. These subprofessionals would do many of the essential duties of the profession which are now being done by the professional staff but which constitutes an inefficient use of the professional's skills. Many of these tasks can be done by the disadvantaged if they are given proper training in performing on the job. The program provides for on-the-job training in a job which actually exists, not a "made job." The individual earns the salary of the entry level. Basic education is provided where needed; and advanced education is encouraged. One of the more appealing aspects of the program is that advancement is possible within the occupational structure.

The New Careers, as presently conceived, are in the fields of health, education, social services, law enforcement, employment service, urban development, child care and recreation. Examples of these nonprofessional or subprofessional occupations are teachers' aides, nurses assistants, laboratory assistants, dietary assistants, and the like. In the field of law enforcement there are possibilities in the simple administrative tasks which trained police officers have to do, but which could be done efficiently by people without their skills. Even in governmental functions many simple tasks could be performed by the disadvantaged who are disqualified because they cannot meet civil service standards.

The New Careers program is essentially still in the project stage yet it has great promise. The U.S. Department of Labor has approved a $2.1 million contract for the training of 6,000 subprofessional health workers over an 18-month period. The training will be provided in hospitals and other health institutions in 13 states. This is merely an example of its possibilities. It is difficult to evaluate its impact on the unemployment of the disadvantaged at this time, however, because it is relatively new. Moreover, it faces certain obstacles that must be overcome. Some of these may be listed as follows:

(1) The disadvantaged themselves must be convinced that this is not just another project where they are the guinea pigs. They must be convinced, further, that this is not just another temporary job, that this job has a future with advancement to a higher level with higher pay.

(2) There is the resistance of professionals, particularly those in the lower eschelons, who regard the employment of nonprofessionals with little education as a threat to their own security. There is the question of status and of income. For example, a nurse who has completed four years of professional training, and who is earning $6,000 per year is not likely to look kindly upon a nurse's assistant who has less than a high school education and who earns $5,000 a year with the promise of higher pay and further advancement. Similarly, the teacher who

presently earns $7,500 a year after several years experience, will be less than happy that her aide, a high school graduate perhaps, began with a salary of $6,000, somewhat more than her beginning salary.

(3) Labor unions have not given their unqualified approval to the program since it appears to bypass their system of apprenticeship and seniority.

(4) Because of Civil Service requirements for employment the government which funds the New Careers program is slow to respond to it. Presently there is before the Congress a bill, introduced by Senator Tydings, which would provide for the investigation of the feasibility of utilizing subprofessional personnel to fill currently vacant Civil Service jobs. The bill further provides for short-term training courses to prepare unemployed persons for those subprofessional jobs which would be delineated in the survey.

Industry in some instances has taken the initiative to deal with the problem of unemployment of the disadvantaged. Although these are not new careers, certainly new opportunities are being opened up for the disadvantaged. While you may have been informed by Mr. Thomas J. Brown, Assistant to the President, Polaroid Corporation, of what business and industry are doing in the employment of the underprivileged, it bears repeating here. Companies which have developed programs designed specifically for the employment and advancement of the uneducated unemployed and the school dropout include the Aetna Life & Casualty Company of Hartford, Connecticut; Argo Corn Products Company, Summit, Illinois; the Campbell Soup Company in its Chicago plant; Carson Pirie Scott Company, Chicago; the J. I. Case Company, Racine, Wisconsin; Bambergers, New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Humble Oil & Refining Company, all of which are cooperating with the Board of Education in a single program in Newark, New Jersey; The Chase Manhattan Bank, New York; Dupont, Wilmington, Delaware; and Western Electric Company in cooperation with the Urban League in Phoenix, Arizona.

This is indeed an impressive list, albeit a small one. It is significant in that it points up what industry and business can do, indeed what it must at least try to do if the unemployment of the disadvantaged is to be significantly reduced at least to the level of what is defined as structural unemployment.

What are the prospects for the employment of the disadvantaged under the New Careers program? In the long run they are considerable. Eventually, the reclassification of occupations, with well defined job descriptions and division of labor will be accepted. Then, on-the-job training along with classes in basic education will be accepted as a matter of course. However, we cannot afford the luxury of waiting that long. The need is immediate; and realistically the present rate of training, of placement of the disadvantaged does not suggest that any significant number of these unemployed will obtain permanent employment in the immediate future. What we must remember is that while the unemployment rate for the nation is something like 3.5 percent, among the poor, the disadvantaged, the rate is as much as 34 percent. And while the rate for white youths, 16-19 years of age is about 10 percent, for nonwhite youths it is 26 percent.

This realistic appraisal need not be a cause for alarm. While it is desirable to reduce unemployment to a minimum no one can expect the problem to disappear overnight no matter how sagacious the program to deal with it. However, this does not justify a policy of laissez-faire. The problem cannot be wished away. The poor, the disadvantaged, are people — they are "for real." They have the same basic needs as the rest of us. They have many of the ambitions and desires of many of us. There is this difference: they have seen too many of their legitimate aspirations end in frustration. As a result, some have become hopeless. Many, and particularly the youth, have become embittered.

The "New Careers" program is the most realistic approach to counteracting the apathy, hopelessness, bitterness and hate of the disadvantaged that has yet been devised. It is based on a sound premise — the employment of people in productive work. It provides for the educational improvement of the person while he is earning a living. It places squarely on his shoulders the decision of how far he will rise in the employment scale. It provides him an opportunity to develop an image of himself as a person of some worth.

The program has had a good start. It needs implementation. It requires (a) a closer working relationship between industry and business at all levels with training agencies, so that training is for a job that exists; (b) business and industry for all their efficiency need to take a more critical look at "who is doing what," in the occupational hierarchy and whether or not much of what is being done by highly skilled and highly paid personnel can be done by personnel with lesser skills and, perhaps more efficiently; (c) above all, the disadvantaged must be assured, in a realistic manner of course, that to the degree that he is willing to take advantage of opportunities to learn, to improve his skills, there is no ceiling to his advancement.

Since a majority of the disadvantaged who are unemployed are Negroes, urban Negroes, ghetto Negroes with all its connotations, this latter point cannot be emphasized too strongly. One of the great dangers of the New Careers program is that the level of entry in the new occupational structure will become the ceiling for many. If the Negro high school dropout qualifies for salesman in a department store he must be convinced that if he is willing to put in the time to improve his education, and learns the business from every point of view, his chances for rising to executive are equal to those of any other employee. Moreover, he must have examples. Please note the plural of the term. The one Negro executive who "made it" no longer suffices.

Finally it should be remembered that the New Careers program is not a panacea for the employment of the disadvantaged. All the traditional avenues of employment must also be opened to them unreservedly. But in the final analysis, the success of the New Careers program depends upon the sincerity with which it is implemented. In the occupations and professions on which the program is focusing there is a need for more than 5 million subprofessionals. It will be tragic if this need is not met.

THE ROLE OF THE URBAN LEAGUE IN OVERCOMING CONSTRAINTS TO THE EMPLOYMENT OF THE UNDERPRIVILEGED

Earl C. Pyle, Project Director
On-The-Job Training Project
Baltimore Urban League

They tell the story about a regional manager of a large company who was solicited for a donation by a rather scholarly educator who said that he and some of his associates were planning a symposium and needed $200.

The manager was quite perplexed by the request. For one thing while he was somewhat awed by them, he regarded the professor and his friends as a bunch of stuffed shirts. To make matters worse, although he was too proud to admit it, he didn't have the foggiest notion what a symposium was.

The manager responded as any resourceful executive would under similar circumstances. He told the visitor he would take the matter under advisement. As you know, in business jargon this means "I don't know the answer but maybe I'll think of one after you leave."

After the caller had departed, our manager summoned his secretary and asked her what a symposium was. She was the kind of a girl who lived with a dictionary at elbow, so she gave him Webster's primary definition. "A symposium," she said, "is a drinking party conducted by ancient Greeks."

Her boss spent a few hours digesting this astonishing bit of intelligence and then got the old professor on the phone. "I've thought over your request," he said, "and we'll be happy to contribute 200 bucks. Frankly I never knew a bunch of guys who needed a symposium worse."

This story came to mind when I began thinking what I might say to you this morning. In all candor, I had some misgivings about coming here. After all, you are bright, creative, experienced and thoughtful officials and educators or the various agencies you represent would not have enrolled you in this workshop. Certainly those who have planned the workshop responded by providing you with a stimulating program, conducted by a talented and well-informed staff.

It seemed clear, in view of these circumstances, that you don't really need to hear another speech. You probably need a symposium worse.

Since I can't turn this into a Bacchanalian orgy, I hope that my remarks concerning the Urban League's role in job development and employment of the underprivileged will not be too redundant.

As many of you may know, the Urban League was founded in New York City in 1910 as a community service organization specializing in the field of race relations particularly in regards to the problems of the Negro's adjustment after having migrated from an essentially rural environment. From these beginnings the organization has grown to where currently aside from a National Urban League office in New York City, a Washington Bureau, there are five regional offices and 83 affiliate agencies in cities throughout the nation.

I can think of no more succinct expression of the Urban League philosophy than that which was expressed by the founder of the National Urban League -- Mrs. Ruth Standish Baldwin and I quote:

> "Let us work not as colored people nor as white people for the narrow benefit of any group alone, but together, as American citizens, for the common good of our common city, our common country."

As the second oldest Civil Rights organization we share in many of the aims and goals of some of the proliferating more militant civil rights organizations but we believe that militancy can be as effectively demonstrated around a conference table as in a "burn baby burn" approach.

The Baltimore Urban League since its founding as an interracial group of civic minded persons in 1924, has constantly sought to foster equal opportunity and to work toward greater inclusion of the Negro in American life. It has widened job opportunities for qualified Negro workers as well as job opportunities for the unskilled and semi-skilled. It encourages and guides young people into rewarding careers. It works to improve family life and neighborhood conditions. It recruits leaders of both races and stimulates them to an awareness of their common stake in community problems. It works with other community organizations, both public and private, to promote adequate housing, health, recreation and welfare services for the entire community. It provides employers with consultation and advisory services on problems of race relations in industry.

If one can visualize available Negro manpower in our cities as a pyramid the apex of which represents those with the highest degree of skill, education and potential and the base representing the great majority of unskilled or semi-skilled or those who are unemployed by virtue of technological change and automation, one can readily appreciate the League's traditional role in opening doors of employment for those qualified Negroes previously denied employment opportunity through discriminatory employment practices. I am happy to say that the League has played a significant role in opening these doors and these skills are being utilized by industry to a far greater degree than was true prior to just a few years ago.

One very serious constraint to the employment of Negroes in business and industry has been the use of unrealistic testing procedures in the hiring process. Since the focus of the League's job development and employment activities has recently been more oriented towards training the unskilled and semi-skilled Negro — we have had some success in encouraging the employer to reevaluate his testing to determine whether the tests were really related to the job or whether they were in fact "screening out" the Negro from a deprived background.

Two programs recently inaugurated by the League have demonstrated a capability to deal successfully with some of the problems of employment of the underprivileged. These are the On-The-Job Training Project of which I am the Director and which I will describe briefly to you and the Labor Education Advancement Program which my friend and colleague Tom Waters will present at the conclusion of my remarks.

In April of 1965, the Baltimore Urban League submitted a proposal to the Department of Labor for Federal funding of an On-The-Job Training project to be sponsored and staffed by the League under the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. This proposal contemplated the placement of a minimum of 200 unskilled or semi-skilled Negroes in on-the-job training positions over a period of 12 months and provided for reimbursement of employers for actual training costs within the limitations as set forth in the Act.

The proposal as submitted was approved by the Department of Labor on August 15, 1965 and funded in the amount of $155,434. Of this amount $25,494 was budgeted for administrative costs including salaries for a Project Director, Field Representative, Trainee Advisor, and Secretary. The balance, $130,000 was reserved for subcontracting funds to reimburse employers for training costs.

Although the project was approved in August, funds were not received until the latter part of September. It was therefore necessary to delay the start of project operations until October 15, 1965. The minimum of 200 placements under the terms of the League's contract with the Department of Labor was reached during July of 1966 and the contract was amended to extend the date of termination to February 15, 1968.

As of this date approximately 2,500 persons have registered as applicants for on-the-job training. A fair percentage of these applicants may be considered almost unemployable by virtue of substantial criminal records, narcotics addiction, gross physical and psychological handicaps, functional illiteracy, alcoholism, or other impairments to consideration for employment. Where possible, applicants in this category were referred to other agencies with greater capabilities for dealing with their particular problem.

On the positive side, careful counseling in grooming, deportment, employer-employee relationships, motivation and education is offered to all applicants and has resulted in marked improvement in the applicants employability in many instances. Where indicated, the General Aptitude Test Battery was administered through the cooperation of the Maryland State Employment Service in order to establish the employment area wherein the applicant demonstrated the highest potential. On-the-job training opportunities in over 85 companies in the Greater Baltimore Area were developed through personal solicitation by the project staff, letters, and publicity releases to the press, radio, TV and other media. In addition, word-of-mouth advertising by successful placements and satisfied employers insures a continuing flow of job orders received and applicants to fill them.

Experience to date indicates that approximately 40 percent of all applicants (800) have been referred to companies where job vacancies existed or where it was known that vacancies might exist in the near future. Of 800 referrals, 559 have been hired to date or slightly better than 20 percent of all applicants registered. These placements have been made in a wide variety of jobs in which the trainee has the opportunity to achieve a skill likely to insure his permanent employment. Some examples of these jobs are heliarc welders, general clerks, clerk-typists, receptionists, general production workers, assemblers, packers, electronics technicians, nurses' aides and other para-medical hospital employment, warehousemen, machine operators, bank tellers, and cashiers.

Based on a projection of even minimal annual salaries, placements made by this program will earn approximately $2,000,000 annually -- a substantial contribution to the economic welfare of the Negro community and at a total cost to the Federal government of only approximately $120 per placement. This cost, of course, may be expected to be recovered and returned to the government through taxes during the first year of employment.

The large majority of placements made by the OJT project has been on a non-reimbursable basis involving no costs to the government in terms of reimbursement for training. Most of the major employers have been reluctant to become involved with the government in a subcontractual relationship but have preferred to accept OJT referrals and place them in their own in-house training programs. As a result, $60,000 of project funds originally allocated to reimburse employers for training costs was deobligated from the $130,000 subcontracting fund item of the project budget at the request of the Department of Labor thus reducing the total project budget to $95,494.

One problem area should be noted here and that is the relative few on-the-job training opportunities or any other type jobs available for the relatively unskilled Negro woman who is reentering the labor market after having taken time out to raise a family. These women are generally in the 25-40 age bracket, have no particular skill but are willing, able, and anxious to work. It would appear that rapid technological changes in manufacturing methods plus automation have practically eliminated the factory type jobs that were formerly usually available to this class of worker. The project has had only limited success in developing jobs for older women and jobs so developed have been, in the main, largely temporary and have not been included in the statistical appreciation of project results contained herein.

Although the continuation of this project beyond its current termination date of February 15, 1968 is subject to the pleasure of Congress insofar as appropriations are made available to the Department of Labor, it is believed that some means, public or private, should be found to insure the continuance of this unique service to the Negro community that has demonstrated its value by the results so far achieved.

THE URBAN REBELLION AND OIC

Lawrence D. Reddick
Executive Director
Opportunities Industrialization Center Institute Inc.

OIC, as others, no doubt, looks upon the so-called urban rebellion as arising out of economic and psychological "causes." As we see it, the prime issues are jobs and self-determination.

As for the economics of the situation, as far back as Adam Smith, the philosophers and leaders of the free enterprise system have insisted that their economic order would make for the widest prosperity and that it would provide jobs for all who are willing and able to work.

Almost every one of the great captains of industry and finance — Carnegie, Rockefeller, and old J. P. Morgan himself, and their successors — have repeatedly emphasized this point. Such a sense of responsibility to the whole society, especially to the masses of working people, appears to be the basic assumption for permitting business leaders to have such a large say in the determination of public policy. The question is therefore pertinent: are these leaders fulfilling that obligation today?

In like fashion, was not the full employment act that became the law of the land under President Truman a similar commitment on the part of government? If this legislation meant anything to the working man, did it not mean that the federal government was underwriting this pledge of the business world that a job would be provided for everyone who was willing and able to fill it. And so, the next question is: has government lived up to this obligation?

The rude fact is, as we all know, that this double pledge has been broken insofar as it applies to the fellow citizens who live in our slums and ghettos.

To some, this change may be vague and obscure, for the statisticians appear to conceal the true situation. They tell us that unemployment is about 4 percent for our nation and cities. This is absolutely untrue for the slums and ghettos. There, forced idleness is often from 33 to 50 percent.

In the first place, the statisticians count as unemployed only those willing and able and who are looking for work. What about those who have looked and looked and now have given up looking? In the second place, what about those who have a part-time job, but want a full-time job? And those who do full-time work but receive part-time pay?

In 1966, the U.S. Department of Labor ventured to take what it correctly labeled as "A Sharper Look at Unemployment in U.S. Cities and Slums," and found that from one-third to one-half of those who were willing and able to work were either working at a wage below the poverty level of $3,000 or had no job at all.

Strangely, the Department of Labor never completed that survey of American urban slums and published its report in such a limited edition that the public has never had a chance to become fully aware of the actual extent of forced idleness in the ghetto.

It, of course, is not necessary with such a well-informed group as this to catalog once again the social evils that arise out of this forced idleness. You name it, and we have it: suffering, defeatism, hostility, crime — the roots are here!

As for the psychological "cause" of urban unrest, we remember that about the same time that Adam Smith was writing The Wealth of Nations, Thomas Jefferson and his colleagues were composing the Declaration of Independence. This, too, was a pledge, we recall, to "all men." And despite everything that has happened in history, during the past decade, it looked as though the American society would, finally, admit "all men" into its affluence and brotherhood. Thus, the decade 1955-65 may be described as a decade of hope — for example, of civil rights and the war on poverty. The dreams of Martin Luther King, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson seemed to merge.

As we all marched arm in arm, on that warm August day in 1963, from the Washington Monument to the Lincoln Memorial — black and white, young and old, labor leaders and churchmen, Northerners and Southerners — almost everything and anything seemed within our grasp. Apparently, the integrated army of compassion and non-violence would gain the victory. The omnibus civil rights bill of '64 and the voter's right law the following year were concrete evidence that vigorous, non-violent, cooperative struggle would bring a better life to all.

But then something happened. Maybe it was that war, half-way round the world. Maybe more than that. Time does not permit an attempt here to analyze the events and forces and personalities that combined to snuff out the dream and destroy the grand coalition. At any rate, the people of the ghetto woke up the next morning, so to speak, feeling that they had been "taken for a ride."

And so, the decade of hope was followed by a crisis of disenchantment. Psychologically, our society seems to be on a slippery down-grade. Groups and people everywhere are falling apart and dropping out of the society. There is, we all know, a turn away from non-violence and a turn toward nihilism, cultism and separatism. The ghetto people have lost faith in the established institutions and leadership of the country.

Well, what can be done to repair this breach? The OIC approach is both economic and psychological. We say jobs first. We believe that whatever is necessary should be done to bring unemployment and subemployment in the ghettos down to the four percent of the rest of the nation. Is this not fair? Accordingly, those communities — those mayors, governors, business leaders — that have inaugurated crash programs for jobs are on the right track. Jobs should have the highest priority, ahead of such other important social improvements as education and housing.

Many of these "instant jobs," we know, are temporary. Some are even of the "make-work" variety. OIC proposes that these temporary employees be trained, given a skill that is marketable, one that will give them a more secure place in the productive economy.

In order to keep their pledge, industry and government will need to provide a million jobs. The Urban Coalition, for one, has already pledged to work for this goal. We will be wise to expect this demand to grow and sweep from town to town, across the nation. The rumblings are not too distant even now. Those communities that are prepared, may find that jobs may be a better assurance of domestic peace than the hundreds of thousands of dollars now being spent on new riot-control equipment and experts. We, with others, hold that whatever is necessary to provide these jobs should be done and should be done with maximum deliberate speed.

OIC would want to emphasize the psychological as well as the economic approach to the ghetto revolt. We have indicated that the people of the inner-city have lost much of their faith in pronouncements, conferences, and the goodwill promises of the establishment.

These folks, like most of us, are struggling to gain or regain some control over their lives. We know that generally speaking this is a period of alienation. All of us seem to be resisting some vast machine, economic and political and perhaps cultural, that would reduce us all to mere cogs in it. Almost every family in the suburbs seems to have a teen-age daughter, who, despite all of the material advantages offered to her, wants to leave home and maybe join the hippies. When you tell her about education, a career, and a suburban husband, with her own mother as the model, she replies, "I don't want to be like mother; I want to be me." As the old television ad used to say, "Mother, I'd rather do it myself."

This general spirit of disaffection takes the form in the ghetto of not wanting outsiders, those who are better off, telling the poor people what's good for them. The residents of the slums do not want some expert from Washington or Philadelphia or City Hall telling them what's wrong with them and how they should improve themselves. Of course, they want good jobs, better education, better homes, but they must have some part in the decisions that make for these improvements; some part in governing their own lives. And unless this element of self-determination is present, the needy and poverty-stricken themselves may reject the plan, no matter how perfect it may seem to be on paper.

So, with OIC, we always begin with the individual "who is to be helped." We begin with the concept of self-help and unless a person is interested in advancing himself or can be so persuaded, there is little that OIC can do for him. Another ingredient is that the natural leaders of the indigenous community must be interested. The people of the suburbs can't come in and organize the unemployed people. This the natural leaders of the community to be served must do.

The third necessary ingredient is that there must be available jobs in the area, and industry must promise that if trainees reach a job-entry capability, they will get those jobs. One of the worse things in the world is to train someone for a job and then, at the end of the training, begin looking for a job that may not be found. These, then, are the three ingredients that must be present for an OIC operation.

OIC first experimented with this formula in Philadelphia back in 1964; the jobless, the community leaders and industry all responded wonderfully well. Three thousand were trained and placed. The success at Philadelphia was so great that many people throughout the nation wrote in or telephoned. In fact, so many wanted to come and see, that the OIC Institute had to be organized to care for this great national public interest. Otherwise, the Philadelphia OIC would not have been able to continue its training program, because of the rush of visitors.

The OIC Institute, with a dozen or so field representatives, offers technical assistance, without charge, to any local group that may desire it. This aid covers the whole range of effort for setting up an OIC steering committee, staffing, establishing prevocational and skills centers and developing contacts for support from business, labor and federal agencies.

Structurally and functionally, an OIC is characterized by an open intake policy, psychological conditioning for a favorable self-image of the trainee, prevocational orientation and, finally, the matching of skills training with available jobs of the area.

OIC trainees are disadvantaged adults of 17 years of age and above, highly motivated and though predominantly black Americans, are often Puerto Rican Americans, or, as in the west and southwest, Mexican- and Oriental-Americans or, as in Roanoke, Appalachian whites. As Sargent Shriver once said, "OIC is an American solution to an American problem." Reverend Leon H. Sullivan, OIC's founder, calls it "The all-American program."

Today, in some 60-odd communities outside of Philadelphia, the OIC idea has spread. Each follows the pattern just described; that is to say, it must begin with the person who wants to improve himself by learning a marketable skill and from that broadens out to local leadership and support.

In fact, we have some 40-odd OIC's scattered over the country with not a penny of federal money. It is only when OIC has become successful locally that the Institute considers attempting to help secure federal funds for the expansion and further development of the local operation. Help from the federal government is to be looked at in the national interest according to the historic principle that we raised high tariff walls to protect infant New England industry while it was getting on its feet and granted federal subsidies to help the railroads span the great plains and mountains of the wild west and helped the aircraft industry reach its present state of growth and profit. It is a thoroughly American tradition to help those who help themselves. Do not the people of the ghetto, who demonstrate self-help, deserve to receive full support from their community and their nation?

We at the O.I.C. Institute believe that the demonstration has been of sufficient success, and that it has been seen and examined by government, business, and labor leaders and a great number of witnesses from the President of the United States on down the line. Perhaps every urban community in the nation ought to have the opportunity of choosing or not choosing to set up an OIC. If the unemployed and the underemployed people are there, if the low entry jobs are there, and if community leaders can be identified and are interested, then the essential ingredients are at hand to develop a self-help operation that would have every likelihood of success.

With support from both industry and government, the OIC concept would surely flourish and well might help the whole nation, especially its economic and political leaders, redeem the pledge that was made to us all by Adam Smith and Thomas Jefferson.

NEGRO APPRENTICES IN THE BUILDING TRADES

Thomas E. Waters
Director, Labor Education Advancement Program
Baltimore Urban League

The Baltimore Urban League has begun work on a unique project in the field of minority employment. With the cooperation of the Baltimore Building and Construction Trades Council and under the auspices of the League's Labor Education Advancement Program, at least 300 minority youths will be recruited and tutored for apprenticeship training.

This "brain-child" of the Urban League, simply called LEAP, is being funded by a $46,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Labor. At least 30 Negroes will be placed in building trades apprenticeship training programs this year.

While it is said that apprenticeship programs within the Trades Council are operated on a non-discriminatory basis, few Negroes have made application. Many Negroes are barred from such programs because inadequate education makes it difficult for them to meet the qualifications for these trades. Through LEAP the League hopes to minimize this barrier.

The federal funds are utilized for pre-apprenticeship training. Preparation sessions for 25 to 30 youths at a time will be held in advance of the written and oral examinations which are required for entry into the trade apprenticeship programs. The training sessions will last from four to ten weeks and will include refresher courses in academic subjects, tutorial services for special needs and assistance in securing all necessary credentials. A series of verbal, intelligence and general aptitude tests will be administered at the beginning and end of the class cycle. In this way, each applicant concerned will acquire a realistic appraisal of his potential.

The unions will then assign those qualified to the trade apprenticeship program to which they are best suited. Then classes will begin again for another group of young men.

The Baltimore Urban League will also supply any supportive services that may be necessary during the waiting period, indenture process and the apprenticeship. Assistance with personal problems is also available. Working with the candidate's family to apprise them of the advantages of the apprenticeship program and the need for their moral support will be important to the individual's success.

Techniques as used in the Operating Procedures of LEAP

Recruitment — Recruitment is handled in many ways: The schools, the churches, the street corners, teen gatherings, places of underemployment, movies, poolrooms and sometimes even crap games.

Tutoring — Tutoring is individually tailored in bringing candidates to a level of passing tests, oral and written. The overall process is varied as the individuals with whom we deal.

Placement — Placement is a dual affair for the staff at the LEAP program in that the unions are apprised of the fact that they are receiving Negro candidates so that adjustments can be made for their intake and at the same time the staff is constantly checking, reevaluating, assessing the candidate's capabilities so that he can make the necessary adjustments prior to placement.

Follow-up — Follow-up is much of what the word implies. In this program it denotes supportive services, persuasive measures to make the apprentice stay with his task. We are basically trying to serve in lieu of a role model because there are no Negro journeymen who can give the youths supportive help.

Major Problems and How They can be Minimized

Recruitment

1. The need of educational resources in the community to guide the youth into a working career.
2. The need for a greater dissemination of what these trades are and some success stories told on their behalf.
3. The need to get to the child during his junior high school days.

Tutoring

1. The need for the schools to prepare the students for the entrance tests.
2. The need to learn skills in projecting one's self in an interview.
3. The need for incentives on the part of the family to encourage the student to continue the tutoring classes.

Placements

1. Placement should be granted on the basis of qualifications only.

Follow-up

To see the on-going problems that the apprentice is confronted with requires a viewing of all of the activities prior to follow-up.

1. Financial condition prior to going to work — the candidates are usually broke.
2. Transportation — if the job is located outside of the city, the public transportation cannot help us in this area. The candidate is at the mercy of whatever he can find or getting into a car pool.
3. Orientation and Education — the orientation period is short and the candidate's lack of knowledge of the trades shows self-frustration, anxieties and sometimes open hostility toward his employment.
4. Role Model — the candidate has no one to relate to, i.e., a Negro sprinkler fitter has no peer in Baltimore City.

If the aforementioned problems are not present then the follow-up would be a detailed account of the apprentice's progress and minor problems. We, therefore, find that the follow-up is an on-going continuing process to minimize problems as they occur in the apprentice's life, socially, educationally, economically.

OE 6000 (REV. 9-66)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

(TOP)

ERIC ACCESSION NO.

CLEARINGHOUSE ACCESSION NUMBER

RESUME DATE 05 - 17 - 68

P.A.

T.A.

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☒ NO ☐

ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☒ NO ☐

TITLE

Education and Manpower Strategies and Programs for Deprived Urban Neighborhoods:
The Model Cities Approach
Final Report

PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)

INSTITUTION (SOURCE)

National League of Cities, Washington, D.C.

SOURCE CODE

REPORT/SERIES NO.

OTHER SOURCE

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

OTHER SOURCE

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

PUB'L. DATE 05 -30 -68

CONTRACT/GRANT NUMBER OEG-1-7-071199-5153

PAGINATION, ETC.

152p.

RETRIEVAL TERMS

Alternatives, Citizen Participation, Collaboration, Compensatory, Cooperation, Decentralization, Deprived, Disadvantaged, Education, Ghetto, Inter-agency, Labor, Manpower, Model Cities, Programs, Remedial, Schools, Slums, Solutions, Strategies.

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT

This report attempts to identify effective strategies that might be used by city and school administrators in planning, initiating, and coordinating comprehensive deprived neighborhood manpower and education programs. It is the result of a four-day workshop of leaders in local government and school systems. These were drawn from 15 cities that had submitted Model Cities planning grant applications. They were assisted by a faculty of expert practitioners, academicians and federal administrators who are involved in education and manpower matters.

The workshop focused on new strategies and programs, innovative approaches to a cooperative action by all agencies, and comprehensive manpower and education development operations. No single path to progress was uncovered; instead a mixture of strategies, experimentation, collaboration and compromise was recognized as the only method that will lead to fulfillment of the needs and desires of our urban society. Out of many discussions and a variety of ideas, the conferees arrived at certain guidelines which will assist cities in successfully executing manpower and education programs.

The words cooperation and coordination must take on real meaning; the involvement of the community must be a working reality; there has to be citizen participation in various aspects of program planning and implementation. The Model Cities concept embodies these ideas and is the best current example of the paths to be followed to solve the urban dilemma.

Received by RAAS
Reports Unit

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

1967-68 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President
MAYOR JAMES H. J. TATE
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Vice President
MAYOR C. BEVERLY BRILEY
Nashville, Tennessee

MAYOR IVAN ALLEN, JR.
Atlanta, Georgia

MAYOR NEAL S. BLAISDELL
Honolulu, Hawaii

CURTIS BLYTH
Nevada Municipal Association

MAYOR J. D. BRAMAN
Seattle, Washington

MAYOR THOMAS R. BYRNE
St. Paul, Minnesota

MAYOR CRAWFORD J. CARROLL
Dover, Delaware

MAYOR FRANK CURRAN
San Diego, California

ROBERT E. FRYER
Michigan Municipal League

MAYOR WAYNE GILLEY
Lawton, Oklahoma

ED JOHNSON
League of Wisconsin Municipalities

MAYOR NATHAN B. KAUFMAN
University City, Missouri

MAYOR WALTER J. KELLIHER
Malden, Massachusetts

MAYOR HERSCHEL I. LASHKOWITZ
Fargo, North Dakota

MAYOR JOHN V. LINDSAY
New York, New York

DAVID L. MANN
New Hampshire Municipal Association

MAYOR DAVID H. McLEOD
Florence, South Carolina

BENNIE SCHMIETT
Utah Municipal League

ED SIMMERMAN
Association of Idaho Cities

JOHN F. WATKINS
Alabama League of Municipalities

MAYOR JUDSON F. WILLIAMS
El Paso, Texas

1967-68 ADVISORY COUNCIL

MAYOR JEROME P. CAVANAGH
Detroit, Michigan

MAYOR THOMAS G. CURRIGAN
Denver, Colorado

MAYOR RICHARD J. DALEY
Chicago, Illinois

MAYOR ORAN K. GRAGSON
Las Vegas, Nevada

MAYOR JOSEPH M. HEALEY
Kearney, New Jersey

MAYOR JAMES W. KELLY, JR.
East Orange, New Jersey

MAYOR JESS LANIER
Bessemer, Alabama

MAYOR RICHARD C. LEE
New Haven, Connecticut

MAYOR HENRY W. MAIER
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

MAYOR ROY B. MARTIN, JR.
Norfolk, Virginia

MAYOR GEORGE M. MILLER
Takoma Park, Maryland

MAYOR ARTHUR NAFTALIN
Minneapolis, Minnesota

MAYOR VICTOR H. SCHIRO
New Orleans, Louisiana

MAYOR ALLEN C. THOMPSON
Jackson, Mississippi

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

PATRICK HEALY
Executive Director

JOHN GARVEY, JR.
Deputy Executive Director

ALLEN E. PRITCHARD
Assistant Executive Director

RAYMOND L. BANCROFT
Managing Editor, Nation's Cities

JOHN K. CHRISTIAN
Publisher, Nation's Cities

LAWRENCE A. WILLIAMS
Director, Contract Research

DONALD G. ALEXANDER
Legislative Assistant

MADELINE BAKER
Director, Federal Aids Service

BEVERLY COLLINS
Office Manager

FLOYD A. DECKER
Research Associate

MICHAEL FISCHETTI
Research Associate

EVAN GOULDING
Administrative Assistant

PETER B. HARKINS
Legislative Assistant

ANDREW B. HORGAN
Research Associate

ROBERT E. JOSTEN
Legislative Assistant

VIRGINIA NERNEY
Advertising Production Manager

PETER VEILLETTE
Research Associate

ED YOUNG
Research Associate